

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 090 844

95

HE 005 442

AUTHOR Hull, W. Frank, IV; And Others
TITLE The American Undergraduate Off-Campus and Overseas: A Study of the Educational Validity of Such Programs. Phase I. Interim Report.
INSTITUTION Toledo Univ., Ohio. Center for the Study of Higher Education.
SPONS AGENCY Institute of International Studies (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C.
BUREAU NO 2-2081
PUB DATE Mar 74
GRANT OEG-0-72-3588
NOTE 134p.; To preserve confidentiality pages 78-187 and 232-280 are not included in this document.

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.75 HC-\$6.60 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS College Students; Educational Objectives; *Higher Education; *Measurement Instruments; Measurement Techniques; Research Projects; *Student Attitudes; *Study Abroad; *University Extension
IDENTIFIERS *Individual Opinion Inventory; IOI

ABSTRACT

This project identified the specific goals sought by a group of off-campus study program directors having much experience who developed an appropriate instrument to assess whether or not the student participants perceived these goals as having been actualized within themselves. The research instrument developed for the assessment was the Individual Opinion Inventory (IOI). Results emerging from this phase of the project indicated: (1) that students of different academic majors responded differently to the instrument, with students in the humanities scoring category items significantly more favorably than students in the sciences; (2) associations of statistical significance were found between the 13 experimental categories of the instrument and (a) the student's present interest in the area of off-campus study, (b) the student's present amount of reading about that area, and (c) the student's present amount of correspondence with individuals living in the off-campus study location. (MJM)

ED 090844

Interim Report

Grant No. OEC-072-3588

W. Frank Hull IV
Center for the Study of
Higher Education
The University of Toledo

Stephen G. Jurs
Leo D. Leonard
Walter H. Lemke, Jr.
Marshall W. Davies

"THE AMERICAN UNDERGRADUATE OFF-CAMPUS AND OVERSEAS: A STUDY OF THE
EDUCATIONAL VALIDITY OF SUCH PROGRAMS," PHASE I

March 1974

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO-
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGIN-
ATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT
OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education

Institute of International Studies

HE005 442

Interim Report

Grant No. OEC O 72 3588

"THE AMERICAN UNDERGRADUATE, OFF-CAMPUS AND OVERSEAS:
A STUDY OF THE EDUCATIONAL VALIDITY OF SUCH PROGRAMS," PHASE I

W. Frank Hull IV, Project Director
Stephen G. Jurs
Leo D. Leonard
Walter H. Lemke, Jr.
Marshall W. Davies

The Center for the Study of Higher Education
The University of Toledo
Toledo, Ohio

March, 1974

The research reported herein was performed pursuant through a grant with the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE


Office of Education

Institute of International Studies

CRITIQUE

A Quarterly Memorandum

Vol. VI, No. 1 (March, 1974)



The Center
for the Study
of Higher
Education

The University of Toledo

Toledo, Ohio 43606

EDITORIAL OPINION

THE INDIVIDUAL OPINION INVENTORY: A PROGRESS REPORT ON THE ASSESSMENT OF OFF-CAMPUS AND OVERSEAS STUDY PROGRAMS

Walter H. Lemke, Jr.*

I. The Need

From classical Greece to modern America, a study séjour away from one's home area has been considered a component not only of an ideal, formal education but also of a complete, personal development. Through a "natural" process of acculturation, the student living and studying outside of his home location theoretically supplements his intellect, expands his cultural awareness, and complements his emotional maturation. Such an experience is deemed to offer intellectual and social rewards and to precipitate positive changes both cognitive and affective.

Until 1919, when the Institute of International Education was founded, study abroad was determined by individual initiative and supportive funds, available from family or patron. After World War I, however, junior year abroad programs were institutionalized by the University of Delaware and Sweet Briar College, organizing for the first time an activity generally believed educationally and personally beneficial. Since the Twenties, an indiscriminate proliferation of off-campus study programs, both in this country and abroad—ranging in quality from the sublime to the abominable—has occurred. Unfortunately, while the experience itself is preconceived as valuable, no completely adequate method of assessment exists. To create or endorse educational policy on the basis of oral tradition or hearsay history is certainly to indulge in capricious administrative behavior, perhaps foolish and surely irresponsible.

*Dr. Lemke, formerly the chairman of a French department, is the Associate Project Director of the research project, "The American Undergraduate, Off-Campus and Overseas: A Study of the Educational Validity of Such Programs." The Project Director is W. Frank Hull IV; Associate, Stephen Jurs, and Senior Consultant, Leo D. Leonard. This project is sponsored by a grant from the U.S. Office of Education, Institute of International Studies.

A review of the research literature in the area of international education programs reveals only a void of frustrations. In general, former research projects have attempted either to superimpose standardized tests on foreign study programs or to employ instruments of measurement specifically designed by the researchers for individual programs. The former efforts proved unsuccessful, as the two components did not mesh nicely. In the latter attempts, nonstandardized tests were demonstrated too gross to measure the very sensitive indices in question. As the coup de grâce to program administrators, research reports were uniformly couched in arcane, statistical jargon, unintelligible to the uninitiated. One could only expect that policy decisions concerning the goals and their implementation in foreign study programs were necessarily based on fragmented, questionable information. Research on off-campus domestic programs appears even worse: it seems nonexistent.

Assessing the intellectual development in a certain area is not an impossible endeavor. With careful pre and post testing, cognitive change on specific dimensions may be measured by using well-defined criteria. Today's educators face a common dilemma and challenge in another area of inquiry, where information is scarce. The need exists for a coherent method of collecting, computing, and analyzing information about the changes in the affective domain of students who study off-campus, either "overseas" or "domestic." This project is attempting to do just that.

II. Development of the Instrument

Here at the Center for the Study of Higher Education, a research team has undertaken to develop an instrument of assessment. Entitled the Individual Opinion Inventory (IOI), the experimental instrument is presently in the developmental stage, about to enter phase II. Designed to monitor and analyze changes in students' attitudes and character development affected by study off-campus, the IOI will ultimately become a descriptive but not a judgmental measuring device.

A constant effort is made to differentiate between evaluation and assessment. Assessment in-

cludes the collection and analysis of data from which intelligent, predictive decisions may be made. Evaluation, in contrast, explicitly contains the superimposition of value-oriented goals onto the resultant data. Those creating and administering study programs endorse value systems, whether overtly or covertly, which they impose on assessment results. Descriptive data from assessment are transposed to a "good-bad" continuum by those responsible for specific programs incorporating precise objectives. Judgmental decisions are the responsibility of the program's administrators, while our task is to aid in this process by providing logical and comparable data.

In phase I of the development of this instrument (from May, 1972, to March, 1974), potential items for the instrument (IOI) were created by the research team in close rapport with knowledgeable persons in the field of international education and off-campus domestic education. Professionals from groups like the Regional Council for International Education and the Great Lakes Colleges Association were consulted for guidance and advice at various times, as were experienced individuals from Antioch College, Earlham College, Otterbein College, Kent State University, and Kalamazoo College. At each stage of initial development, the IOI was reviewed and revised in light of the counsel received.

To complement advice from professionals, Dr. Hull interviewed individually students studying off-campus during the 1973-1974 academic year in New York City, Philadelphia, Bogota, Cuernavaca, and Tokyo.* The team believed that computerized data were insufficient to furnish information perhaps extremely sensitive and that phraseology mutually comprehensible to both students and researchers was imperative. These direct personal interfacing afforded insight valuable to the phrasing of the item questions plus sundry bits of subjective information which, otherwise, would have been unfortunately neglected.

After a trial run and further revising, a pilot test of the instrument was conducted. As the IOI developed, it became more sensitive and more precise, carefully monitored by the team statistician, Dr. Jurs. In its present experimental stage, the instrument was administered to three groups of U.S. students from thirty-two (32) institutions of higher education. Form A was given in pre and post tests to a substantial number ($N=378$) of students who studied abroad at sixty-two (62) "foreign" locations. Form B ($N=110$) was similarly applied to student groups studying in thirty-six (36) off-campus locations, like those in Philadelphia and New York. Finally, a third student sample ($N=246$) was tested. This last group was composed of juniors in college who had remained throughout their undergraduate career on

their home campus. These students functioned as a baseline reference against which changes in the other two groups of students could be ascertained.

In the analysis process, the thirteen (13) categories within the instrument were subjected to both content and empirical validation. Specific items were correlated to their category to determine if the item needed more revision. Care was taken to insure that each item tapped only one personal trait and that the dimensionality of each category on all three forms was the same. Moreover, study programs known to differ in some basic areas were compared to discover if the category scores were sufficiently sensitive to disclose those differences. At the end of phase I, these measures are generally acceptable and very encouraging for an experimental research instrument at this stage of development. The reliabilities of the thirteen (13) experimental categories were computed using the coefficient alpha, a measure of internal consistency.

III. Early Results

At present, preliminary results from phase I are emerging from the data. While one hesitates to present initial findings lest they be interpreted incorrectly as absolutes, tentative results seem to indicate that several key factors do, indeed, relate to the affective changes which occur in students studying off-campus. The following represent the most intriguing implications so far.

First, the replies of students responding to the instrument were analyzed to ascertain if background characteristics varied systematically with program outcomes. For example, it was discovered that students of different academic majors responded differently, with students in the humanities scoring category items significantly more favorably than students in the sciences. This pattern of differences of associations with a student's major field of study occurred more frequently on Form A than on Form B or C.

Second, associations of statistical significance were found between the thirteen categories of the instrument and (1) the student's present interest in the area of the off-campus study, (2) the student's present amount of reading about that area, and (3) the student's present amount of correspondence with individuals living in the off-campus study location. On Form A, those students who gave the most positive responses (i.e., claimed the most positive outcomes from their study experience) also indicated a sustained interest and involvement in the location of the off-campus study. These patterns emerged less frequently on Forms B and C.

Third, the length of stay at the off-campus location was closely associated with the outcomes as reported by the students on Form A, but not always in the same direction. For example, longer stays off campus were related to higher scores in

*The Tokyo interviews were made possible by a grant from The Lilly Endowment, Inc.

categories like "Comparing and Observing Societies Different from One's Own," but they were also related to lower scores in the category of "Developing Tolerance." Longer stays were also associated with improved reported foreign language fluency and the use of the foreign language, as well as with a more positive image and a more positive evaluation of the instructional program at the off-campus study location.

Fourth, statistically significant differences existed between category scores of students who studied in various locations throughout the world. In the five major geographical areas considered (Europe, Africa, Middle East, Central and South America, and the Far East) the general pattern of responses indicated that students in non-European locations responded more positively on the various categories.

Fifth, the presence of a "host family" or roommate resulted in no systematic differences in the scores of the categories on Form A. The same result occurred on the roommate category on Form B.

In brief commentary on these tentative findings, differences linked to the student's major field of study are not surprising. One might reasonably expect that those factors determining one's major could also influence changes which occur in the student's perceived affective values. Similarly, those students reporting a high involvement with the area of their off-campus study, as measured by their present reading and correspondence habits, could be expected to rate their off-campus experiences quite positively.

More unusual were results from the item concerning the length of stay at the off-campus location. The most positive student reported outcomes were from those who had studied off-campus from 27 to 52 weeks. Interestingly, the second most positive time duration was that of ten weeks or less. One might speculate that those students in the latter group were highly motivated and stayed so briefly that the expected period of disillusionment never could have occurred. These two results would indicate that programs of one year's length and of 10 weeks or less (i.e., summer programs or one month interim programs) are presently the best opportunities for positive affective change. By implication, those programs of one quarter or one semester might be too brief to permit an optimistic upswing after a "down" period and too long to sustain an initial impetus of high personal motivation. As this project eventually plans to continue measurement at a two-year and four-year interval following a student's return from off-campus study, it will be extremely helpful to see if both time duration groups remain significant or if the "10 weeks or less" group proves to experience immediate impact only.

Concerning the tentative results apropos of the geographical location of the off-campus experience,

one would hypothesize that such findings would likely emerge. Logically, experience in a culture quite similar to the student's own would probably affect less change than experience in a culture radically different. Thus, students studying in Europe indicated less favorable responses than those staying in Central and South America, the Middle East, and Africa. These findings do *not*, certainly, imply the abolition of study programs in Europe. Rather, these results indicate what *kind* of outcomes may be expected in students choosing various geographical areas. Further, desired affective changes cannot be divorced from desired academic opportunities. Obviously, the total impact of a program in Africa should differ from that of a program in Western Europe or New York City. Program directors and those administrators making policy decisions would surely profit in knowing the direction and intensity of affective changes which are likely to occur in specific programs.

Finally, the lack of systematic differences, to this point, based on the presence or absence of a host family or roommate is really not astounding after some consideration. Rather than the presence or absence of the two factors, the quality of the relationship between the American student and the host family or the roommate appears significant. In the former relationship, students of different majors had different degrees of success with their host family. In the latter instance, there is a correlation between the quality of the relationship between the roommates and the major field of study of the individuals. Data will be clearer on the quality of the relationships in phase II.

Again, one must caution that these initial findings are tentative. The IOI as a measuring instrument is still in experimental development. Conversely, these early results are certainly interesting and, on occasion, arresting and provocative. With a most recent grant from the Institute of International Studies, the continuance of the project is insured until Spring, 1976.

The research team has learned a great deal from phase I and, as in any experimental study in a complex area, is now able to specify the precise needs and procedures of phase II. With the apparently successful development of the research instrument in phase I, the task for phase II becomes the carefully controlled collection of data from a technically precise sample, for the purpose of rigorous program assessment. Accordingly, pre-post data during phase II will be collected in cooperation with six (6) institutions: (1) a state university college on the East coast; (2) a state university college on the West coast; (3) a private liberal arts college in the Midwest; (4) a large program in cities in Denmark; (5) two branches of a U.S. university in Nairobi and Ghana; and (6) a well-known domestic study program in an East coast city. These locations mirror significant differences found during phase I and hence are expected

to be the locations of the most pregnant research validation efforts for the IOI in phase II. Each site has been carefully selected because of its committed ability to meet the requirements of the data collection and because of the presence of a highly qualified professional at the site to collect the data as specified.

At the end of phase I, the IOI was sharply reduced in size. Only those items which had been proved effective were retained. Post Form A, the questionnaire designed for students returning from study abroad, for example, was pared from 183 items to 94. Thus, at the locations specified above, the procedure will be as follows with the revised instrument:

1. Pre tests of the IOI on Forms A and B will be administered to *all* students leaving the designated U.S. institutions for off-campus study between Spring, 1974, and September, 1975.
2. Form C will be administered to a randomly selected number (equivalent to those going off-campus) of sophomores and juniors at the United States institutions in the Spring of 1974, November-December of 1974, and Spring of 1975, to provide a baseline for post-affective changes at the sample United States institutions. This group will be used for comparative purposes, since the requirements for a technically correct control group will most likely prove to be impossible to meet.
3. Pre and post tests of Form A will be administered to all students arriving and departing the two international study centers designated above, and pre and post tests of Form B to all students arriving and departing the domestic study center designated above (between Spring, 1974, and September, 1975).
4. A carefully selected representative sample of students at the two international locations and the one domestic location specified above will be interviewed by the project director and associate to provide detailed case study analyses illustrative of the range and type of affective changes occurring during off-campus study.
5. The data will be analyzed during the Fall of 1975.
6. The report will be presented March, 1976.

In summary, the emphasis of phase II will be on (1) *rigorously and systematically* collected pre and post data on the IOI for formal validation of the IOI as a research instrument and (2) further and more detailed investigations of affective "changes" which are attributable to study off-campus, domestic and international.

IV. Conclusion

If the IOI proves successful, the advantages of its availability would be numerous. Practically, an assessment instrument of off-campus study programs would probably be welcomed by those presently involved in the organization and direction of such programs. While control of selection criteria is explicitly *not* one of the goals of the IOI, predictions of student outcomes would prove immeasurably valuable. High school counselors, undergraduate advisers, and all foreign language people could begin to plan and to advise according to reliable information rather than according to guesses. Students could also know within certain limits what to expect of an off-campus program.

Second, those responsible for implementing off-campus study programs of specific natures would have an instrument capable of providing crucial information on which consequential decisions could be based. As an illustration, program administrators stressing fluency in a foreign language would know that the most beneficial results might be expected from a constellation of specific factors. Another program directed by a religiously oriented institution might want to devise a way to stress the development of tolerance and the development of the value system of the individual. In both cases, those specific values described as objectives might be more effectively measured with the use of the IOI. The process of implementing goals would be indicated by the comparison of the predictive scores on the measuring instrument before the student's departure and the ultimate scores upon return.

Third, the IOI would make a sortie into the domain of educational accountability. Federal and state governments, for example, have grown increasingly curious and aggressive in their demands for financial accounting and responsibility. This trend will not be reversed in the future as higher education becomes more expensive, tax dollars rarer, and private contributions more selective. The golden age of higher education, symbolized by the formerly glib professorial attitude toward grants, is now a legend. From legislators counting tax dollars to parents footing the bills to students stepping onto charter flights, the range of accountability is wide and its nature demanding.

As the Carnegie Commission has so convincingly demonstrated in many of its publications, assessment and accountability, now crucial concepts in education, will surely enter the permanent, professional lexicon. Thus the Individual Opinion Inventory is designed for those involved and concerned with off-campus education. If traditional national boundaries dissolve and supranational or regional mentalities present new perspectives, the comprehension of the mechanisms of attitudinal change in students will become more and more significant. As the concept of a world view gains ascendancy, educators must afford students those experiences deemed most likely to be beneficial.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	v
I. The State of the Research Knowledge	3
II. This Present Study	14
III. Instrument Validity and Reliability	18
Responses to the Separate Items and Item Total Correlations	19
Reliability Coefficients	20
Analyses of Variance	20
Intercorrelations of Categories and Criterion	20
Factor Analyses	25
Summary	27
IV. Interpretation of Findings	28
Form A	28
Form B	34
Form C	36
V. The Emerging Results, Phase I	40
BIBLIOGRAPHY	46
APPENDIXES	
A. Tables	73
B. Individual Opinion Inventory, Phase I	
Form A	78
Form B	98
Form C	111

	Page
~~C. IOI Subscales, Phase I~~	
~~Form A~~	~~125~~
~~Form B~~	~~151~~
~~Form C~~	~~170~~
D. IOI Analyses of Variance, Phase I	
Form A	188
Form B	200
Form C	207
E. Average Category Responses on 1-5 Scale	212
F. IOI Means, Phase I	
Form A	213
Form B	221
Form C	227
~~G. IOI Experimental Category Items for Phase II, Form A-2~~	~~232~~
H. IOI Common Items and Categories, Phase II	238
I. IOI, Phase II	
Form A-1	241
Form A-2	248
Form B-1	260
Form B-2	266
~~Form C-1~~	~~271~~

In order to preserve the confidentiality of the testing instruments, pp. 78 - 187 have been omitted for purposes of reproduction by ERIC.

Also, pp. 232 - 280, referring to Phase II of the project, have been withdrawn.

Information on either of the above, may be requested from the Project Director, Dr. W. Frank Hull.

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Coefficient Alpha Reliability Coefficients	21
II. Category and Criterion Intercorrelations, Form A	22
III. Category and Criterion Intercorrelations, Form B	23
IV. Category and Criterion Intercorrelations, Form C	24
V. Factor Analyses of Forms A, B, and C.	26
VI. U.S. Colleges in Phase I Data	73
VII. Major-Minors Represented in Phase I Data	74
VIII. Location of Overseas Study, Phase I Data	75
IX. Location of Domestic Study, Phase I Data	76
X. Experimental Categories, Phase I	77

FOREWARD

Herein is to be found the report on phase I of a very complex and difficult undertaking: an assessment of off-campus education programs for undergraduates of American colleges and universities. When this was first proposed, there was a great deal of skepticism as to its chances of success. At the conclusion of phase I, there remains skepticism in certain specified areas - and there have been problems. But the chances of success have been significantly increased. It is a project report that must be read in light of the fact that it is truly "in progress," but it is appropriate to share where we now stand as phase II has begun.

The project has been funded by the United States Office of Education, under the authority of Title VI, section 602, NDEA, Mrs. Julia A. Petrov, Research Chief. The Tokyo interviews were made possible through a complementary grant from the Lilly Endowment, Inc., Dr. Landrum R. Bolling, Executive.

In addition to the cooperation and ever present counsel of Mrs. Julia Petrov, there are others whose efforts and assistance merit acknowledgement. Dr. Stephen G. Jurs, Associate Professor, Department of Research and Measurement, serves tirelessly as the Research Statistician and Data Analyst. Dr. Leo D. Leonard, Associate Professor, Department of Educational Theory and Social Foundations, is Senior Consultant. Dr. Richard Stavig, Kalamazoo College; Dr. Irwin Abrams, Antioch College; and Dr. Ivan Putman, The State University of New York, have devoted many gratis hours of careful counsel. Mr. Henry Acres, formerly President of The Great Lakes Colleges Association, and Mr. David Hoopes, formerly Vice President of The Regional Council for International

Education, both contributed a major effort in working to establish the project's design as well as many of the items and experimental categories. In fact, the original ideas generated out of conversations with Mr. Acres. Individuals at most of the institutions represented by both of these groups have gone out of their way to assist in many ways.

Dr. Walter H. Lemke, Jr., has joined the effort as Associate Project Director and is proving increasingly responsible as he pauses from his own career as a French professor and accepts joint responsibilities for the quality and conduct of the effort. Mr. Marshall W. Davies and Mr. Duane E. Whitmire have provided doctoral assistance in specific areas noted herein. Last, but surely not least, Mrs. Sandy Willier, a public school teacher by day, has constantly performed the lonely task of typing and retyping, again and again, the various revisions of the instruments and work sheets as well as this report. Surely she has proven her skill, patience, and good humor.

In short, many individuals have contributed. However, in the final judgments, I have no one to blame but me. We have all learned a great deal about a very complex and important educational entity. There remains much to discover, but our most significant success, to this point, is the fact that we are now at the point where to the answers and hunches of the theorizer and practitioner alike, we are now able to pinpoint the discerning questions.

March, 1974

W. Frank Hull IV
Project Director

"The American Undergraduate,

Off-Campus and Overseas:

A Study of the Educational Validity

of Such Programs"

In the words of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights:

Education shall be directed to the full development of the human personality and to the strengthening of respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms. It shall promote understanding, tolerance and friendship among all nations, racial or religious groups, and shall further the activities of the United Nations for the maintenance of peace.¹

In light of such ideals, in these United States of America we find ourselves in the position of watching legions of young Americans each year travel outside our political boundaries on study programs or on their own, yet we know very little about how such experiences affect them. We assume that they develop their cognitive skills - at least students in formal study programs typically present some certification which is extrapolated into academic credit toward degree completion at the home institution. While there exists some discussion of how such credit should be "evaluated" in the academic records, there is general agreement that the young Americans do increase their cognitive skills while abroad.

But, education of the nature implied in the above United Nations document is much more than the mere acquisition of cognitive skills, as important as they are. A liberal arts education, at the college level, is a perspective, not a formula. It assumes, as do many of the philosophical and theological undergirdings of the United States' societies, that the individual is unique and that he deserves to have his own potential developed to the fullest extent beyond the acquisition of cognitive skills. Education includes the

¹"Universal Declaration of Human Rights," UNESCO, Article 26, 2 (1948) cf. "International Covenant on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights," adopted by the United Nations General Assembly (1966), especially Article 13.

development of intellectual facilities and moral responsibilities in each individual.

In fact, we know precious little of the impact of collegiate education upon the individual's affective values. However, when we specifically consider the American student who studies away from his home college or university for a period of time, our knowledge appears even less precise. What happens, in specific, to the American undergraduate who studies in Hong Kong, Nairobi, London, or Paris or who studies in New York City or Philadelphia? Beyond having been there and having studied with instructors not available on his home campus in Ohio or Iowa, what differences are there between these undergraduates and those who remain on the home campus throughout their undergraduate career?

As James M. Davis has admitted:

Obviously we are working on faith because we really have very little evidence of what happens as a result of international educational experience. I see no reason to be quite so ignorant as we are now, having been in the business twenty years.²

He is right. The need for accountability, which is becoming increasingly prevalent in higher education in the United States, should apply to off-campus educational programs, both domestic and international.

Any researcher who sets forth to study "impact" is immediately confronted with a very complex task. Various research strategies exist³ to meet specific purposes, but one must never underestimate the complexity of the assessment

²James M. Davis, as quoted in Allan A. Michie, ed., Diversity and Independence Through International Education (New York: Education and World Affairs, 1967), pp. 70-71.

³cf. Kenneth A. Feldman, "Research Strategies in Studying College Impact," ACT Research Report, No. 34 (May, 1970).

problems to be encountered.⁴ Indeed, to study the student who leaves his home institution to go elsewhere for a period is a very difficult task, for, as a monk of Froidmont reminded us in the twelfth century:

The scholars are wont to roam around the world and visit all its cities, till much learning makes them mad; for in Paris they seek liberal arts, in Orleans authors, at Salerno gallipots, at Toledo demons, and in no place decent manners.⁵

I. The State of the Research Knowledge⁶

During the 1950's and 1960's higher education in the United States witnessed a major increase in the number of off-campus "overseas" (i.e. beyond the United States' political boundaries) programs for students still in their undergraduate program. Along with an increase in off-campus "overseas" study programs, there has also developed an increased interest in the assessment of such programs. In 1967, for example, the Federation of Regional Accrediting Commissions of Higher Education issued a "Policy Statement on Undergraduate Study Abroad Programs," which read, in part:

Study abroad is increasingly accepted as an important phase of many undergraduate programs in American colleges and universities. Carefully planned and administered,

⁴Rodney T. Hartnett, Accountability in Higher Education: A Consideration of Some of the Problems of Assessing College Impacts (Princeton: College Entrance Examination Board, 1971).

⁵Quoted in John A. Symonds, Wine, Women and Song (London: Chalto and Windus, 1907), p. 17.

⁶For formulation of this section, the project director is indebted to Marshall W. Davies, a doctoral candidate who worked on this project from its beginning through August, 1973, and who is now at the Office of the Provost, Antioch College. It should be noted that most of the research reviewed here concerns "off-campus overseas" programs due to the major lack of solid research on "off-campus domestic" programs.

opportunities for foreign study can add significant dimensions to a student's educational experience. At the same time, the great diversity of programs poses serious problems for evaluation and control.⁷

The general literature dealing with students studying off-campus "overseas" is sizeable. Most of it, however, has focused on students from other countries who were studying in the United States. The remaining part of the literature, dealing with American students off-campus "overseas," consists largely of descriptive materials of various individual study programs.

There are, though, several significant studies which have attempted to methodically assess study off-campus "overseas" for American undergraduates. In these studies the researchers have first determined what it was that off-campus "overseas" study should accomplish. This criterion has generally been expressed in terms of the goals of the particular study program and/or in terms of what the researcher believed would be an appropriate measure of "success," e.g., an increase in "worldmindedness," a decrease in "dogmatism," etc. Instruments were then used to locate shifts on the criteria measure. Such studies can be conveniently, if somewhat roughly, divided into two types: those studies that made use of existing instruments to detect shifts on the criteria measure and those studies that make use of instruments created specifically for the particular research study.

Considering first the studies which emphasized existing instruments, a small group of Adelphi College seniors who went "overseas" were studied by

⁷As quoted by Allen O. Pfnister, "General Evaluation of Study Abroad Programs Under the Auspices of American Colleges and Universities" (paper presented at the meetings of the National Association for Foreign Student Affairs, Atlanta, Georgia, May 3, 1972), p. 6. Pfnister further notes that during 1972 in the city of Madrid, Spain, alone, there were thirty established academic year programs and almost as many summer programs. Over 1,000 American students were expected in Madrid for the year, while the number for the summer was expected to exceed 2,000.

Elizabeth W. Leonard in 1959 to determine the extent to which they realized the stated objectives of their sojourn.⁸ Beyond several instruments constructed by the researcher, the emphasis was on standard instruments including the Allport-Vernon "Study of Values,"⁹ and Adorno's "Ethnocentrism Scale," "F Scale," and "Political-Economic Conservatism Scale."¹⁰ The instruments were chosen because they were thought to measure different groups of the objectives that had been established for the study program. In determining these objectives, each of the participants was asked to list his individual goals well before the sojourn began. The faculty likewise prepared a list of goals, and the student and faculty goals were later compared in a seminar. "The students listed their own goals under the faculty goals, found a high degree of agreement and accepted them (the faculty goals) without major change."¹¹

Results were encouraging, as increases were found in "liberalizing attitudes" and in "cultural attitudes leading to international understanding." There was a gain in foreign language scores, an increased knowledge of the geography of Western Europe, a reduction in political-economic conservatism, and a gain in "self perception." Unfortunately, the sample contained only fourteen students who had been matched on several variables rather than randomized. Pre- and post-tests were used; there was no control group.

⁸Elizabeth Waugh Leonard, "Selected General Education Outcomes of a Foreign Travel and Study Program" (unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Pennsylvania State University, 1959).

⁹Gordon W. Allport and Philip E. Vernon, Study of Values (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1931).

¹⁰Theodore W. Adorno, The Authoritarian Personality (New York: Harper, 1950), pp. 110-23.

¹¹Leonard, op. cit., p. 72.

Nevertheless, this early study does clearly indicate reason for research optimism in looking closely at the influence of off-campus "overseas" study programs on the participants' affective values.

Nine years later in 1968 Eric P. Kafka utilized a different set of standard instruments on students returning from a ten-week off-campus "overseas" program. The entire sophomore class¹² of Justin Morrill College, an experimental college with a cross cultural focus within Michigan State University, was studied in an attempt to locate greater increases in "world-mindedness" among those students who had spent their summer "overseas" studying than among those who had remained in the United States.

In addition to Sampson and Smith's "Worldmindedness Scale,"¹³ Kafka also used the Rokeach "Dogmatism Scale,"¹⁴ Prince's "Differential Values Inventory,"¹⁵ and demographic data in an attempt to discover any variables related to changes in "worldmindedness" regardless of overseas study. However, he failed to find any variables related to a significant change in "worldmindedness" nor was the increase in "worldmindedness" by the overseas study group large enough to be statistically significant. Kafka felt that the "Worldmindedness Scale" was possibly not a sensitive enough instrument for research on "overseas" study.¹⁶

¹²The sophomore class consisted of 208 students. Eighty-one who studied "overseas" became the experimental group while the remaining 127 who spent the summer in the United States became the control group.

¹³Donald L. Sampson and Howard P. Smith, "A Scale to Measure Worldminded Attitudes," The Journal of Social Psychology, 45:99-106, 1957.

¹⁴Milton Rokeach, The Open and Closed Mind (New York: Basic Books, 1960), pp. 73-84.

¹⁵Kafka does not adequately document Prince's instrument.

¹⁶Eric P. Kafka, "The Effects of Overseas Study on Worldmindedness and Other Selected Variables of Liberal Arts Students" (unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1968), pp. 76-77, 158-163.

Charles T. Smith, Jr. in his 1970 study of the Kalamazoo College "overseas" study program went beyond merely looking for the influences of an "overseas" study experience as a whole. He attempted to link "changes" in participants' attitudes, values, and interests to specific characteristics of the "overseas" study program. Using the College Entrance Examination Board foreign language reading and listening tests, the Allport-Vernon-Lindsey "Study of Values,"¹⁷ Kalamazoo College's own Evaluation Form, and the Educational Testing Service "College Student Questionnaire,"¹⁸ Smith found six program characteristics productive of attitude, value and interest development (as measured by the above instruments). The two most powerful of these were "breadth of exposure to non-Americans" and "the presence of an American subculture." He further located more change in students who lived with host families than in students who lived in dormitories and more change in students who received instruction in English or a combination of English and the host language than in students who received instruction entirely in the host language.¹⁹

Another study by Edward E. Morgan, Jr. researched the Regional Council for International Education's program in Basel, Switzerland.²⁰ This three-part

¹⁷Gordon W. Allport, Philip E. Vernon, and Gardner Lindsey, Study of Values (Cambridge: Riverside Press, 1960).

¹⁸Educational Testing Service, "College Student Questionnaire" (Princeton: Educational Testing Service, 1965).

¹⁹Charles T. Smith, Jr., "The Relationship of Program Characteristics of the Kalamazoo College Foreign Study Programs to Changes in Participants' Attitudes, Values, or Interests" (unpublished Doctoral dissertation, The University of Michigan, 1970).

²⁰Edward E. Morgan, Jr., "The American College Student in Switzerland: A Study of Cross-Cultural Adaptation and Change" (unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Pittsburgh, 1972).

study focused on changes in participants' values and attitudes as measured by the researcher, changes and change agents as perceived by the students, and adaptation to the "cross cultural experience." The first part of the study made use of several "standard" instruments; the second part was based on experimenter designed questions and experimenter conducted interviews, while the last part used data gathered in both previous parts as well as additional data from existing records, observation, "personal knowledge,"²¹ and interviews.

In looking for differences between pre- and post-test scores on the Allport-Vernon-Lindsey "Study of Values," the Rokeach "Values Scale,"²² and the Rokeach "Dogmatism Scale," Morgan failed to locate any statistically significant differences, but explained this by suggesting that the use of measures of central tendency had overlooked significant individual changes. He contended that the shifts that did occur on individual scores were "probably very meaningful."²³ The second part of the study was conducted by asking the returning students what had happened to them. Two highly structured but open ended questions were used, and the types of change and change agents articulated by the students were systematically categorized. The major finding was the absence of "academics" as a change agent. In reporting such Morgan said:

It is easy to discern that the academic component of the program did not make any noticeable impact on the students and

²¹Morgan spent nine months in Basel, during academic year 1969-1970 observing the forty-five students that he studied.

²²Milton Rokeach, Beliefs, Attitudes, and Values (San Francisco: Jossey Bass, Inc., 1968).

²³Morgan, op. cit., p. 49.

if it is to be considered as a major component of the program it has failed miserably.²⁴

In the final part of the study, Morgan developed a typology into which he could fit each of the Basel students according to the way that they personally adapted to living and studying in a foreign country. From this he concluded that the patterns of adaptation depended largely on the cultural conditioning that the student had before he arrived in Switzerland.

A research project conducted by Harrison G. Gough and William A. McCormack is another that utilized existing instruments. Gough and McCormack did not set out to test any predetermined idea about education abroad. Rather, the purpose of their study was:

...purely exploratory--to investigate different domains of testing and forecasting, and to see whether any promising leads could be uncovered which could then provide the starting point for a larger, longer, and more definitive study.²⁵

Using a sample of fifty-eight students who had participated in the 1965-1966 education abroad program at the University of California at Berkeley, Gough and McCormack based their criteria of performance "overseas" on four measures: peer nominations, directors' ratings, overseas grade point average, and each student's own evaluation of the worth of his overseas experience. The researchers then collected additional data on their sample, administering a ten-hour battery of tests, consisting of seventeen separate instruments²⁶

²⁴Morgan, op. cit., p. 66.

²⁵Harrison G. Gough and William A. McCormack, "An Exploratory Evaluation of Education Abroad," Cooperative Research Project No. S-440 (unpublished study, University of California at Berkeley, 1967).

²⁶e.g., College Vocabulary Test (Gough, H.G., and Sampson, H., The College Vocabulary Test. Berkeley: University of California, Institute of Personality Assessment and Research, 1954); McClosky's scales for economic and conservatism (McClosky, H. "Conservatism and Personality," American Political Science Review, 1958, 52, 27-45); Barron-Welsh Art Scale (Welsh, G.S., Preliminary Manual: Welsh Figure Preference Test, rev. ed., Palo Alto, California: Consulting Psychologists Press, 1959); etc.

measuring numerous intellectual and personality variables as well as gathering available existing information.

The data were used in a variety of analyses, but of particular concern here is the section of the study that dealt with the prediction of success. Using their four criteria of performance overseas, Gough and McCormack correlated these criteria with each other and with the variables that had been used in selecting the students for overseas study.²⁷ The first three of the criteria were found to be significantly intercorrelated and were viewed as "three slightly different facets of an overall assessment of quality of performance."²⁸ The fourth criterion--the student's own evaluation of the worth of his overseas experience--stood alone and was clearly an independent measure which Gough and McCormack felt "should be studied... as an independent criterion."²⁹ This study represents the first serious attempt to use the returning student's perception of what happened to him as a valid research criterion.

Research studies utilizing only specially designed instruments contain only two studies, but one of them is possibly the best known research on overseas study programs. This is the evaluation of the University of Delaware-Sweet Briar College junior year in France program done by Robert C. Pace in 1959.³⁰ The heart of this study was a questionnaire designed by

²⁷i.e., grade point average in language at application; overall grade point average at application, semester units of language study at application, and rating by a "selection committee."

²⁸Gough and McCormack, op. cit., p. 80.

²⁹Ibid.

³⁰Robert C. Pace, The Junior Year in France: An Evaluation of the Delaware-Sweet Briar College Program (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1959).

Pace which contained six subscales that measured opinions and attitudes which he felt should have been fostered by an overseas study experience.³¹ The sample of 500 former students was drawn³² from all of the participants in the program between 1923 and 1953 while a control group was drawn from among those who were students during this time but did not study in France. Comparisons made between the control group and the sample led Pace to conclude that "participation in... (the study abroad) program makes a difference in the subsequent lives of its alumni."³³

In a study done at Antioch College in 1968, Paula Spier established that it was possible to isolate predictors of success in overseas study. Using a sample of 536 students who had participated in the Antioch Education Abroad program between 1957 and 1966, Spier designed four instruments that attempted to measure a student's "performance overseas" and several variables that were possible predictors of that performance. The "Judgemental Overseas Performance Scale" ("Performance Scale") was a subjective rating of each student by the researcher on the basis of the information available in each student's individual folder after his return from overseas. According to Spier the factors used to rate each student on the "Performance Scale" can perhaps best

³¹The subscales were designed to measure: international, political, or governmental activities; activities relating to foreign culture; freer exchange between countries; the role of the United Nations; policies of the United States in relation to the United Nations and other countries; degree of acceptance of people of other cultures, nationalities, races, and religions.

³²This was not a random sample, but rather was a self selected sample which included everyone who returned his questionnaire.

³³Pace, op. cit., p. 68.

be generalized as a combination of demonstrated achievement and "graceful adaptation."³⁴ The other three scales measured variables that Spier hoped would predict scores on the "Performance Scale." On the first of these, the "Judgemental Prediction Rating Scale," each student was rated by the researcher "based on all the information available" in the student's folder. The "Academic Prediction Index" was based on the student's grade point average, and the "Co-op Prediction Index" was determined from the ratings of the students by their employers during participation in Antioch's regular extramural work periods. The ratings on the "Performance Scale" were correlated with the ratings on the other three instruments, and the results indicated that all were significant predictors of overseas success. Additional findings were that sex, year of study (i.e., sophomore, junior, etc.), and country of study³⁵ were not predictors of success.³⁶

Dividing previous research into the two categories above helps to highlight one of the basic problems of researching "overseas" study - instrumentation. In discussing the results of his work, Erich Kafka pointed this out when he said:

While seeking appropriate instrumentation in the vague field of attitude change the researcher has to choose between standardized tests which are of proven quality but have not yet detected change from cross-cultural exposure, or locally-devised tests in which the reliability and validity are questionable.³⁷

³⁴Paula Spier, "Predictive Factors in Selection for an Overseas Study Program" (unpublished study, Antioch College, 1968), p. 36.

³⁵There was one exception: those students who studied in Great Britain had a significantly higher "level of performance" than those who studied in other areas.

³⁶Spier, op. cit.

³⁷Kafka, op. cit., p. 121.

Although some researchers have attempted to check the reliability and validity of their "local" instruments, these checks have been far from complete.³⁸

In summary, research on American students studying off-campus "overseas" is far from complete. Noteworthy studies in this area are comparatively few in number,³⁹ although there have been some interesting results. Evidence has been found, for instance, indicating that success in "overseas" study may be predicted for certain individuals.⁴⁰ Many studies, to be sure, have yielded primarily "no significant differences."

In general the participant's own perceptions, however, have not been considered as part of the research criteria. The students, and through them the programs, have usually been measured in terms of what someone else thought to be appropriate. The Adelphi students in Elizabeth Leonard's study had an opportunity to influence the goals of their program, but they chose otherwise.⁴¹ In his study of American students in Switzerland, Edward Morgan did use student interviews to determine what type of change had taken place in students

³⁸Spier made a reliability check of her "Judgemental Overseas Performance Scale" by correlating her ratings of a sample of the students with the ratings made by another individual of the same sample (Spier, p. 38). She used a similar process to check the reliability of her "Prediction Rating Scale" (Spier, pp. 34-35). Smith attempted to validate returning students' self-ratings by correlating the results of the self-rating with the results of other individuals who rated the students (Smith, pp. 41-59).

³⁹There are, for instance, far more studies dealing with "foreign students" studying in the United States than with Americans studying overseas.

⁴⁰cf. Gough and McCormack, op. cit.; and Spier, op. cit. A study presently in progress under Dennison Nash, Professor of Anthropology, University of Connecticut, on American students who participated in the University of Connecticut's junior year in France program during 1970-1971, seems likely to add significantly to the research knowledge presently available and should be noted here.

⁴¹Leonard, op. cit.

and what change agents were, but student responses were not used as a criterion of success.⁴² Only in the Berkeley study was the perception of the student used as a part of the criterion of success.⁴³

II. This Present Study

In the specific project reported herein:

"It is assumed that the ultimate goal of international exchanges is to contribute to friendly and peaceful relations among peoples of the world, but that many more immediate goals relating to technical cooperation, changes in institutions, success in academic training, increased knowledge about foreign cultures, preparation for a useful career, readiness to cooperate in international undertakings, etc., may all require consideration."⁴⁴

The task for this project was thus to identify the specific goals sought by a group of "quality"⁴⁵ off-campus study program directors having much experience and to develop an appropriate instrument to assess whether or not the student participants perceived these goals as having been actualized within themselves.

In all of this, a crucial distinction needs to be remembered: Assessment refers to the act and process of studying qualitatively and quantitatively a particular event or series of events upon an individual or individuals.

Evaluation is the act and process of taking the data and concepts discovered in assessment and of adding a value judgement to that data. For example, in

⁴²Morgan, op. cit.

⁴³Gough and McCormack, op. cit.

⁴⁴Otto Klineberg, "International Exchanges in Education, Science, and Culture: Suggestions for Research," International Social Science Council (Paris: Mouton and Co., 1966), p. 11.

⁴⁵"Quality," here means programs and their directors generally recognized among international study abroad programs and domestic off-campus programs to be well planned and executed. Thus "quality" programs are those where it is believed that the participants will be experiencing the "best" in off-campus education.

an assessment study one might discover that 98% of the sample population studied presently report accepting Professor X's theories or report having developed a strong like for French wines or report having never entered a library or report having read a book during the year or report having only talked to other Americans overseas. When one begins to make statements implying the value or lack thereof, good or bad, on any of that data, one has moved to the level of an evaluation statement.

It should be perfectly clear that the present study is an assessment study, where the goal is to produce particular data on specific study experiences in both a "macro" and a "micro" sense. When the data are produced, then and only then will it become the task of various educational leaders - including the directors of off-campus study programs - to make a judgement as to the "value" of the programs which set out to accomplish the specific goals for which assessment is being attempted in this present multi-phased research project.

In developing an instrument for this assessment task - an instrument which we have chosen to call the "Individual Opinion Inventory," hereafter referred to as the "IOI" - the attempt has been made to encourage, if not to force, individuals knowledgeable and highly respected in the profession of "off-campus" educational programs to specify not only the precise formal and informal goals of their programs but also the visible effects of the off-campus study that they view in deciding which students have had a "good experience" in contrast to those who have had a "poor experience." This was accomplished through a series of indepth interviews with personnel at various institutions associated with the Great Lakes Colleges Association and the Regional Council for International Education. It is to be stressed that interviews were only

conducted with persons judged to be of superior knowledge and quality in the opinion of the cooperating associations.⁴⁶

Because of the complexity of the task, the research team thought a "pre pilot testing" of the IOI would be helpful in order to conduct further revisions of the instrument's items. The pre pilot was conducted between October 1, 1972, and November 30, 1972, at the Great Lakes Colleges Association institutions and especially at Kalamazoo College through the cooperation of Professor Richard T. Stavig. Only students who had returned to the home campus from an "off-campus overseas" program for fall, 1972, were sampled. This testing resulted in a revision of the IOI during January, 1973.

Various assumptions and item wordings were then checked by the project director with students in the process of "off-campus" education at the following locations: Bogata, Columbia; Cuernavaca, Mexico; Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; New York, New York; and Tokyo, Japan. Further revisions were made.

Three forms of the IOI were under development:

Form A, for students returning from an off-campus experience outside of the political boundaries of the United States

⁴⁶In specific, personnel at: Antioch College, Dr. Frederick Klein, Paula Spier, Dorothy Hyatt, Dr. Irwin Abrams; Earlham College, Dr. Lewis Hoskins, Dr. Richard Woods; Kent State University, Dean Thomas R. Knipp, Dr. Roy Wenger, Dr. Charles F. Kegley, Dr. Sam Biedler; Kalamazoo College, Dr. Richard T. Stavig; Otterbein College, Vice President Roy Turley. From The Great Lakes Colleges Association, President Henry Acres and Mr. William Petrek and from the Regional Council for International Education, Vice President David Hoopes, provided endless counsel. Goals were stated and restated, and items were developed and then revised between May 15, 1972, and October 1, 1972. Dr. Ivan Putman Jr., The State University of New York, also has provided counsel throughout.

Form B, for students returning from an off-campus experience within the political boundaries of the United States.

Form C, for students in their "junior" year who had participated in no off-campus study.

Between March and September, 1973, data were collected⁴⁷ and resulted in completed returns from students who had studied at sixty-two "foreign locations" (cf. Appendix A), at thirty-six "domestic locations" (cf. Appendix B), and represented thirty-two institutions of post secondary education in the United States (cf. Appendix C). The response numbers 378 students on Form A, 246 on Form B, and 110 on Form C.

In intent, this assessment project hopes to eventually test students prior to their departure for "off-campus" study, immediately following their "off-campus" study, two years after their "off-campus" study, and four years after their "off-campus" study. Samples of students at the "home institutions" - from which those students in the study going "off campus" come - will be used as a baseline for comparative purposes.⁴⁸

This present report is, therefore, to be read as a report of an experimental research assessment in progress. What follows are the results, conclusions, and findings of the first phase, i.e., the experimental development of the IOI as an assessment device to this point in time. A great deal of work still remains.

⁴⁷ Besides the institutions of the Great Lakes Colleges Association, and Regional Council for International Education, data also collected at the University of California through the cooperation of Dr. William Allaway.

⁴⁸ This assumes that all of the technical requirements for a "control group" will most likely not be able to be met.

III. Instrument Validity and Reliability⁴⁹

The psychometric properties of the experimental categories of items on the IOI were analyzed through several approaches. The primary method of analysis was to inspect carefully the number of respondents who selected each of the possible response options. This analysis indicated which items were answered in a variety of ways. Items which were answered the same way by the vast majority of respondents were of little use in differentiating students who had positive or negative off-campus experiences.

A second analysis was the item-to-category total correlations. Correlations were considered adequate when they were positive and significantly different from zero. For the present sample sizes, this would mean that the correlations would have to be approximately .20 or greater. Items that did not have correlations with category totals of that magnitude could be suspected to not be internally consistent with the other items on that particular category and hence would warrant revision or deletion.

The reliability coefficients which were computed for each of the categories of items were coefficient alphas, a measure of the internal consistency of the items in each category. It was hoped that the size of the reliability coefficients would be at least .70 so that individual scores could be interpreted as being moderately accurate. Reliability coefficients less than this would suggest the need for reconsideration of some or any number of the items grouped within a particular category.

Other analyses included analysis of variance where the differences in the means of groups of students were determined not to be a function of chance.

⁴⁹Primary responsibility for this section was assumed by Dr. Stephen G. Jurs, Associate Professor, Educational Research and Measurement, The University of Toledo.

In other words, groups that were suspected to differ on a particular variable were compared to see whether the differences were reflected in the category scores. Categories that consistently failed to reflect those differences were judged to warrant reconsideration.

A final set of analyses was common factor analyses on Forms A, B and C. The purposes of these analyses were: (1) to establish the interrelationships among the categories of the form, and (2) to see whether the patterns of interrelationships of categories were the same for all three forms.

A summary of the results of these analyses follows.

A. Responses to the Separate Items and Item Total Correlations

The frequency counts of responses to each of the items on Forms A, B and C appear in Appendix D. It can be seen from these data that some items were more effective than others in terms of identifying the various ways in which the students perceived their off-campus experience. When the students were in great agreement on items, it was decided to delete those items for the subsequent phases so that respondents would have fewer items to deal with and thus be better able to concentrate on them.

The item-to-total correlations were especially important in terms of identifying items that did not tend to measure the same trait as did other items to which it was logically related. Items with negative or close to zero correlations will be culled out for subsequent phases so that respondents will only need to deal with those items which have been shown to be both logically and empirically related to the construct being measured. Inspection of the correlations which appear along with the response frequencies indicated that at least five and frequently many more than five items in each category had sufficiently high correlations to warrant their retention in revised IOI forms for Phase II of the project.

B. Reliability Coefficients

The coefficient alpha reliability coefficients for the category scores of Forms A, B, and C appear in Table I. As is clear from these coefficients, the reliabilities of the experimental categories varied considerably. There was a general trend for decreasing magnitude of these coefficients from Forms A and B to Form C. Although many of the coefficients were substantial, more of them were inadequate. It is possible to estimate with the Spearman-Brown formula how much each of these experimental categories would need to be increased to reach acceptable reliability of .7 or .8. Clearly the required increases are too great for an instrument already too long.

C. Analyses of Variance

Significant differences between groups of subjects on the experimental categories also help to establish the construct validity of those category scores. A large number of such analyses have been performed. These analyses provide, to a great extent, the results of the pilot study of off-campus programs. These appear in the following section of this report. When interpreting those differences, remember: to the extent that hypothesized differences between groups of subjects can be confirmed empirically, the construct validity of the categories has been established in part.

D. Intercorrelations of Categories and Criterion

Other analyses included the intercorrelation of the categories. Tables II, III, and IV indicate those correlations and the correlation of the category scores with a set of criterion items which define a positive off-campus experience (e.g., was your off-campus program the best part of your college program?).

Table I
Coefficient Alpha Reliability Coefficients

<u>Category</u>	<u>Form</u>		
	A	B	C
Developing Tolerance	.73	.85	.60
Feelings Directed toward the Home Institution	.48	.53	.32
Social Interaction with those of a Culture Distinct from One's Own	.43	.55	.24
Experiential Living with and within a Host Family Structure	.97		
Experiential Living with a Roommate	.54	.69	.00
Comparison of Societies Distinct from One's Own	.46	.40	.38
Observation of Society Distinct from One's Own	.49	.43	.00
Instructional Program Distinct from that Available at the Home Institution	.51	.46	.81
Appreciation of a Culture Distinct from One's Own	.55	.43	.00
Development of the Individual Person	.85	.84	.75
Language Competency - Comprehension	.80		
Language Fluency	.79		
Language Use	.28		

Table II

Category and Criterion Intercorrelations, Form A

I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX	X	XI	XII	XIII	Criterion
.35													.16
.27	.28												.10
.20	.15	.15											.15
-.02	-.06	.02	-.09										.08
.42	.24	.28	.07	-.09									-.05
.32	.25	.37	.06	-.06	.29								.33
.32	.39	.49	.07	-.08	.27	.49							.18
.26	.36	.49	.15	-.07	.32	.38	.50						.10
.58	.50	.35	.11	-.07	.47	.47	.51	.36					.01
.25	.14	.27	.35	-.10	.17	.30	.27	.27	.30				.16
.16	.14	.30	.36	-.07	.11	.25	.25	.30	.22	.85			.09
.12	.09	.34	-.04	.21	.10	.24	.26	.22	.14	.06	.12		.07

Table IV

Category and Criterion Intercorrelations, Form C

I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX	X	Criterion
.39										.29
.15	.19									.74
-	-	-								.06
.04	.01	.06	-							-.02
.32	.25	.37	-	.08						.27
.13	.21	.34	-	.08	.32					.15
.21	.42	.23	-	.01	.26	.26				.33
.10	.08	.08	-	.02	.04	-.03	-.11			.06
.57	.57	.22	-	.04	.41	.29	.46	.09		.49

The correlations for Forms A, B, and C range widely and hence require a more parsimonious description before interpretation. Consequently factor analyses were performed and are reported below. The corrections with the criterion scores were not uniform. That is, many of the experimental category scores which might be expected to be potent predictors of the criterion were not substantiated empirically. For Form A, the experimental category, Comparison of Societies Distinct from One's Own, was the best predictor. For Form B, the best predictor of this criterion was Social Interaction with those of a Culture Distinct from One's Own, and for Form C, as would be expected, the best predictor was the attitude toward the category, Feelings Directed toward the Home Institution. The large number of non-significant predictors sheds some doubt on the predictive validity of the experimental category scores.

E. Factor Analyses

The summary of the results of the factor analyses on Forms A, B, and C appear on Table V. The factor analyses determine the underlying dimensionality of the matrices of correlations among the experimental category scores. The program used to calculate these results was the BMD03M program which performed a principal axis solution with a varimax rotation.

The analyses yielded two factors on Form A but only one factor each on Forms B and C. These results suggest that the experimental categories of the pilot IOI did not measure distinctly different traits. Instead, responses were more on a global basis, hence the subscore totals did not, at least in this analysis, demonstrate the construct validity that might have been anticipated.

Table V

Factor Analyses of Forms A, B, and C

	Form A		Form B		Form C	
	I	II	I	II	I	II
		h^2		h^2		h^2
Developing Tolerance	.65	.13	.68	.58	.57	.35
Feelings Directed toward the Home Institution	.42	.05	.63	.47	.62	.37
Social Interaction with those of a Culture Distinct from One's Own	.22	.18	.00	.05	.41	.21
Experiential Living with and within a Host Family Structure	.12	.39				
Experiential Living with a Roommate	-.05	-.07	.07	.07	.07	.01
Comparison of Societies Distinct from One's Own	.52	.04	.54	.38	.54	.28
Observation of Society Distinct from One's Own	.35	.15	.61	.54	.42	.20
Instructional Program Distinct from that Available at the Home Institution	.32	.11	.65	.50	.54	.30
Appreciation of a Culture Distinct from One's Own	.24	.16	.44	.29	.07	.05
Development of the Individual Person	.71	.12	.79	.69	.78	.09
Language Competency - Comprehension	.16	.86				
Language Fluency	.03	.86				
Language Use	.06	.02				
Eigen Values	3.70	1.27	2.81		2.29	

F. Summary

In summary, it can be said that the pilot IOI Form A performed somewhat better than did Forms B and C. Some of the reliabilities of the experimental category scores were lower than might have been anticipated. Factor analyses indicated that the dimensionality of the experimental categories was less than was anticipated. The correlations of the items with the corresponding category totals, however, identified a large number of individual items that did perform adequately. In light of these factors, the IOI will be able to be shortened (for subsequent phases) to include only those items with predictability. The experimental categorical analyses are unwarranted as the assessment task can now clearly be better handled on an item by item base. In short, phase I has located multiple appropriate and tested items in each of the areas of the experimental categories and the experimental categories, themselves, can be deleted from subsequent phases.⁵⁰

⁵⁰ A study of the off-campus programs of Kalamazoo College done by Marshall W. Davies provides additional validation data for the IOI. Davies' study found that persons who had highly positive off-campus experiences scored significantly better than students with poor off-campus experiences on the Appreciation of a Culture Distinct from One's Own and Development of the Individual Person categories, but significantly lower on the Feelings Directed toward the Home Institution category. Davies also found that positive off-campus experiences could be predicted less well by SAT verbal scores than by the IOI categories.

IV. Interpretation of Findings⁵¹

This section points out the significant differences between various groups on the experimental categories and the direction of the relationships. For a more complete description, the reader is directed to the appended tables.

A. Form A

1. Length of stay at the off-campus location. Considering the relationship between the length of stay at the off-campus location and the experimental categories studied within the IOI, the following experimental categories were significantly related:

- Social Interaction with those of a Culture Distinct from One's Own
- Language Use
- Instructional Program Distinct from that Available at the Home Institution
- Appreciation of a Culture Distinct from One's Own
- Observation of Society Distinct from One's Own
- Experiential Living with and within a Host Family Structure
- Language Fluency
- Language Competency - Comprehension
- Feelings Directed toward the Home Institution
- Development of the Individual Person
- Developing Tolerance

In other words, a direct association occurred between the length of stay at the off-campus location and the above experimental categories. For example, the longer an individual student stayed off-campus the more he was likely to report he had interacted with others from the off-campus area, used their language, and developed an appreciation for their culture and mores - which is a reasonable expectation.

⁵¹Responsibility for this section was assumed by Dr. Leo D. Leonard, Associate Professor, Educational Theory and Social Foundations, The University of Toledo.

To this point, colleges and universities concerned about the length of stay off-campus should recognize that the greatest benefits, as perceived by students, from extended off-campus stays can be expected to be derived within the affective areas listed. It would appear that those items most influenced by length of stay off-campus were those that we would have hypothesized at the beginning of our study. Taking the categories of Experiential Living with and within a Host Family Structure and Instructional Program Distinct from that Available at the Home Institution as examples, it appears obvious that the longer an individual stays off-campus, the more he will interact with others, use their language, and appreciate their culture.

Variations in length of stay did not increase one's language fluency, observations of the foreign society, development of tolerance or attitude toward one's host family or home institution. Length of stay had less relationship with a student's comparing a foreign culture with his own and had virtually no relation to attitude toward one's roommate. The reader is directed to the tables in the appendix to see how long the students considered the most beneficial length of time to spend off-campus.

It must be remembered that these results represent a student's perceptions of change and change agents. This kind of source of information has certain advantages and limitations, which will be discussed later in the section entitled General Conclusions and Implications.

2. Major field of study of participant. Individuals with different majors differed significantly on the following four categories:

- Language Use
- Observation of Society Distinct from One's Own
- Appreciation of a Culture Distinct from One's Own
- Developing Tolerance

These findings seem to agree with hypotheses commonly held by program directors and researchers. It would also appear that students outside of the social sciences and humanities see themselves as equally adept as other majors in appreciating a foreign culture and in competently using its language.

3. Extent of previous travel by participants. Individuals reporting various levels of previous travel differed significantly on the following four categories:

- Social Interaction with those of a Culture Distinct from One's Own
- Appreciation of a Culture Distinct from One's Own
- Language Use
- Instructional Program Distinct from that Available at the Home Institution

The implications of these findings are as one might have expected. Previous travel may provide sophistication in forming attitudes about one's program of study, the culture visited, and the use of a foreign language. Surprisingly, the particular amounts of previous travel had little association with the perceived development of the student. Similarly, the categories of Instructional Program Distinct from that Available at the Home Institution, Experiential Living with and within a Host Family Structure, and Experiential Living with a Roommate seem to have less affect on the well traveled individual. We might hypothesize that these students view themselves as already tolerant and perhaps knowledgeable of the host culture before departure. The data, however, do not completely clarify this issue, at this point.

4. Participation in previous off-campus study programs. This section considers the effect that other off-campus programs, in which the student had already participated while in high school or college, had in influencing the student. One must not forget that various degrees of time lag affect

the conclusions tentatively reached in this section.

As no systematic differences were located, one might speculate that as time passes and the student's specific perceptions blur, myriad variables intervene to cloud initial opinions, or that the college student is at a developmental stage that is uncorrelated with his past high school experiences off-campus or overseas.

5. Previous residence of participant. Here we consider the previous residence (rural, urban, suburban) of the student, and how it may relate to the other categories. Two categories showed significant results:

Feelings Directed toward the Home Institution
Development of the Individual Person

The interpretation of the group means listed in the appendix indicates that urban, suburban, or rural residence - in that order - affects a student's perception of those change factors measured by the IOI. On the above two significant variables, students from rural areas judge their home institution more negatively and score lower on the Development of the Individual Person category than students from urban or suburban locations.

6. Present correspondence with off-campus location individuals. This section examines the direction and significance that the IOI experimental categories have with a student's present correspondence with acquaintances made during his overseas study program. These categories proved significant:

Social Interaction with those of a Culture Distinct from One's Own
Appreciation of a Culture Distinct from One's Own
Language Use
Instructional Program Distinct from that Available at the Home Institution
Observation of Society Distinct from One's Own
Feelings Directed toward the Home Institution
Development of the Individual Person

As might be expected, social interaction was directly related to the amount of present correspondence reported. Those persons with the highest levels of correspondence tend to have the most positive patterns of response to the aforementioned experimental categories.

7. Present reading by participant of off-campus materials. The present reading level of materials from and about the off-campus area were significantly related to the following experimental categories:

- Appreciation of a Culture Distinct from One's Own
- Instructional Program Distinct from that Available at the Home Institution
- Social Interaction with those of a Culture Distinct from One's Own
- Observation of Society Distinct from One's Own
- Feelings Directed toward the Home Institution
- Language Fluency
- Development of the Individual Person
- Language Use
- Experiencial Living with and within a Host Family Structure
- Language Competency - Comprehension
- Developing Tolerance
- Comparison of Societies Distinct from One's Own

Students who perceived themselves as having the most appreciation of a "foreign culture," strongest instructional program, keenest observation of society, and high frequencies of social interaction continued to read the host culture's literature.

8. Present interest of participant in off-campus area. This analysis is similar to that above which asked the student to respond concerning his present reading of foreign materials and correspondence with off-campus foreign acquaintances. Significant differences were found in the following experimental categories:

- Appreciation of a Culture Distinct from One's Own
- Instructional Program Distinct from that Available at the Home Institution
- Observation of Society Distinct from One's Own
- Social Interaction with those of a Culture Distinct from One's Own

Development of the Individual Person
 Language Fluency
 Feelings Directed toward the Home Institution
 Language Use
 Language Competency - Comprehension
 Developing Tolerance

While nothing astounding emerges here, these comparisons support the construct validity of the IOI. Persons describing themselves as still interested in the off-campus location also responded most positively on the above categories.

9. Geographic location of participants. The following categories were significantly related to the geographic location of the off-campus study program (Europe, Middle East, Africa, Far East, South and Central America):

Instructional Program Distinct from that Available at the Home Institution
 Social Interaction with those of a Culture Distinct from One's Own
 Language Use
 Language Fluency

However, the means data analyzed by continent of off-campus study indicated that non-European locations can be expected to have produced more affective change as perceived by the students than European study locations.

10. Presence of a host family. The following experimental categories differed systematically with the presence or absence of a host family:

Language Competency - Comprehension
 Language Fluency
 Appreciation of a Culture Distinct from One's Own
 Social Interaction with those of a Culture Distinct from One's Own
 Observation of Society Distinct from One's Own

Presence of a host family was positively related to development of the student's language competency and appreciation of the "foreign culture." These two factors - language proficiency and awareness of the foreign culture - are precisely goals and objectives which many program directors have established and endorse.

Surprisingly, the host family's presence seems to have little relation to the individual's perceived personal development, his ability to compare two societies, or his use of the foreign language.

11. Presence of a roommate. There were no significant relationships identified between the presence of a roommate and the experimental categories on the IOI. In light of traditional, subjective opinions, the absence of correlated findings may seem unusual and unexpected. One might hypothesize that the presence per se of a roommate is not as crucial as the quality of the relationship between the two peers.

12. Association of participant with another religion. No significant relationships appeared from that data between the student's own religion and his interaction with people of another religion.

B. Form B

As Form B was administered to students who experienced off-campus study programs within the confines of the United States, the Experiential Living with and within a Host Family Structure and foreign language categories were obviously omitted from this form.

1. Length of stay of participant at off-campus location. None of the categories on the IOI proved significantly correlated to the length of stay of the student at his off-campus location. One might speculate that the programs where the present data were collected were not sufficiently varied in the length of stay to provide such relationships.

2. Major field of study of participant. Only Feelings Directed toward the Home Institution as a category correlated with the major field of the student

participating on an off-campus, national study program. Such a finding seems to indicate that the student's major does relate to his opinion of his home college or university. From the tables of means it would appear that students majoring in the humanities and the social sciences have the most positive responses to the home institution.

3. Extent of previous travel by participant. No findings of relationships between the extent of prior traveling the student had done and the other categories on the IOI emerged. While some differences were shown on Form A, no such correlations appeared on Form B. data.

4. Participation in previous off-campus study program. No category proved statistically significant when correlated with any previous experience in off-campus study programs. This is of particular interest in light of the number of Form B students ($N = 24$) who had been on previous off-campus study experiences.

5. Previous residence of participant. Three categories of the IOI emerged significantly related to the type of previous residence (rural, suburban, urban) of the student doing off-campus but national study. These were:

- Developing Tolerance
- Feelings Directed toward the Home Institution
- Appreciation of a Culture Distinct from One's Own

The more positive responses on the above categories were given by students who had previously resided in an urban area.

6. Present correspondence with off-campus location individuals. Present levels of correspondence between students and individuals from their off-campus location were not systematically related to the responses on the experimental categories.

7. Present reading by participants of off-campus materials. No significant differences appeared in this analysis.

C. Form C

Form C was administered to students who did not experience any elements of off-campus study. As these students remained on their home campuses for the duration of their academic career, the categories of Experiential Living with and within a Host Family Structure and foreign language were obviously omitted.

1. Major field of study of participant. These categories proved to be significantly related to the major field of study of the student:

Experiential Living with a Roommate
Observation of Society Distinct from One's Own
Social Interaction with those of a Culture Distinct from One's Own
Development of the Individual Person

Fine arts and humanity majors tended to have more positive scores on the social interaction/observing interaction type category. Students in the natural sciences tended to respond less positively. The same pattern was located on the Development of the Individual Person category and the Experiential Living with a Roommate category.

2. Extent of previous travel by participant. These categories were significantly correlated to the extent of previous travel the student had experienced:

Experiential Living with a Roommate
Development of the Individual Person
Instructional Program Distinct from that Available at the Home Institution

More travel seems to facilitate the development of a good relationship with a roommate, of personal growth, and of a positive opinion of the instructional

program of the student's college or university. According to the tables, travel in foreign countries seemed most important in influencing such changes.

3. Participation in off-campus study program. Comparing those students who had participated previously in an off-campus study program and those who had never done so, significant differences on the following categories were located:

Instructional Program Distinct from that Available at the Home Institution
Observation of Society Distinct from One's Own
Feelings Directed toward the Home Institution
Development of the Individual Person

Unlike Forms A and B, on which no significant differences appeared, Form C seems to indicate that having participated in an off-campus study program may influence how the student who remains on his undergraduate campus for his undergraduate career perceives the home institution and its instructional program. Approximately one third of those students completing Form C reported a prior off-campus study experience. Persons with prior off-campus study scored more positively to the above experimental categories.

4. Previous residence of participant. Only the attitude toward one's instructional program correlated significantly with residence of the student. Those students from the suburbs tended to be most positive toward the instructional program of their home institution, urban students less so, and rural students least so. It seems that students from rural areas are least positive toward the instructional program of the home institution of any student population. This is similar to the pattern found in both Forms A and B.

5. Present reading of local materials. Respondents who read more materials from and about the town or area surrounding the home campus responded more positively on the following experimental categories:

Observation of Society Distinct from One's Own
Social Interaction with those of a Culture Distinct from One's Own
Development of the Individual Person
Developing Tolerance

Such findings may indicate that, for students who stay on their home campus, social interaction and observing of society relate most significantly to the reading of local material of these students. Also, the general pattern of response indicates a lack of interest or appreciation in a "foreign" culture.

D. General Conclusions and Implications

To this point, a number of tentative conclusions from Form A may be stated. It would appear that those individuals who were off-campus for the longest lengths of time, who were most involved in their program, who had a strong commitment to a foreign language or who had traveled to the off-campus location previously saw themselves as developing the strongest in terms of tolerance, social interaction and appreciation of the foreign culture. Social interaction, appreciation of a foreign culture and the observing of society are most enhanced by the presence of a host family where this is possible. It would seem that participation over a longer period of time in the off-campus location, the use of a foreign language and the presence of a host family, are most significant factors as perceived by the student. The factors especially relate to the student's continuing to read material about and from the off-campus location, and continued participation in correspondence with individuals from that location.

Fewer systematic differences were located for Forms B and C. Extent of previous travel by the participant, length of stay for Form B students, and participation in previous off-campus study programs were not associated with differences in the experimental categories in the same manner as was found for Form A. Patterns similar to Form A results were located for persons of various majors and various previous residences, i.e. rural, urban, suburban. Precise differences between groups of students on A, B, and C are found in the tables of means within the appendix. Differences in patterns of responses by students on Forms A, B, and C may be as much a function of types of students responding as the types of programs in which they have participated, to this point. Estimates of the magnitudes of effects on students from various programs are confounded by student self selection into programs. Longitudinal, pre-post assessment will minimize this confounding. Such data will be available at the completion of phase II.

In conclusion, phase I of this project has generated instruments that have been capable of locating significances between various groups of students who participate in off-campus study programs. Appendix G shows the specific items from Form A, to be retained for phase II of the project. These are items that have shown high item to experimental category total correlations, i.e. they are measuring whatever trait is being measured by the category itself. These items also represent breadth of content (content validity) in that they include the important aspects of the experimental category. For example, the five items for the Observation of Society Distinct from One's Own category provide a broad perspective of the topic, observing society, rather than one narrow focus of this area. Hence logical and empirical validity were considered in our effort to reduce the number of items required

on the instrument. The instruments used to collect that data reported above appear as Appendix B. The current revision of the instruments to be used during phase II appear as Appendix I.

V. The Emerging Results, Phase I⁵²

In most research projects, the reader might rightly expect to find a section at this point of the report giving the "conclusions" of the project. To do such in this project, however, would be misleading and incomplete. The project, during phase I, has located various interrelating variables, but the experimental and the developing nature of the instrument throughout this first phase as well as the varying means by which different on-campus directors sampled their students, makes it impossible to go much beyond the mere listing of what could be called "emerging results." Clearly the termination of phase I does find certain results emerging, but the reader is cautioned to view these results as tentative at this point.

All of this having been said, the following represent the most intriguing results of phase I:

First, the replies of students responding to the instrument were analyzed to ascertain if background characteristics varied systematically with program outcomes. It was discovered that students of different academic majors responded differently, with students in the humanities scoring category items significantly more favorably than students in the sciences. This pattern of differences of associations with a student's major field of study

⁵²Primary responsibility for this section was assumed by Dr. Walter H. Lemke, Jr., Associate Project Director.

occurred more frequently on Form A than on Forms B or C. This is in line with what prior research would have hypothesized.

Second, associations of statistical significance were found between the thirteen experimental categories of the instrument and (1) the student's present interest in the area of the off-campus study, (2) the student's present amount of reading about that area, and (3) the student's present amount of correspondence with individuals living in the off-campus study location. On Form A, those students who gave the most positive responses (i.e., claimed the most positive outcomes from their study experience) also indicated a sustained interest and involvement in the location of the off-campus study. These patterns emerged less frequently on Forms B and C.

Third, the length of stay at the off-campus location was closely associated with the outcomes as reported by the students on Form A, but not always in the same direction. For example, longer stays off-campus were related to higher scores in categories like "Comparing and Observing Societies Different from One's Own," but they were also related to lower scores in the category of "Developing Tolerance." Longer stays were also associated with improved reported foreign language fluency and the use of the foreign language, as well as with a more positive image and a more positive evaluation of the instructional program at the off-campus study location.

Fourth, statistically significant differences existed between category scores of students who studied in various locations throughout the world. In the five major geographical areas considered (Europe, Africa, Middle East, Central and South America, and the Far East) the general pattern of responses indicated that students in non-European locations responded more positively on the various experimental categories.

Fifth, the presence of a "host family" or roommate resulted in no systematic differences in the scores of the experimental categories on Form A. The same result occurred on the roommate category on Form B.

In brief commentary on these tentative findings, differences linked to the student's major field of study are not surprising. One might reasonably expect that those factors determining one's major could also be of influence in any changes which occurred in the student's perceived affective values. Similarly, those students reporting a high involvement with the area of their off-campus study, as measured by their present reading and correspondence habits, could be expected to rate their off-campus experiences quite positively.

More unusual were results from the item concerning the length of stay at the off-campus location. The most positive student reported outcomes were from those who had studied off-campus from 27 to 52 weeks. Interestingly, the second most positive time duration was that of ten weeks or less. One might speculate that those students in the latter group were highly motivated and stayed so little time that the expected period of disillusionment never could have occurred. These two results would indicate that programs of one year's length and of 10 weeks or less (i.e., summer programs or one month interim programs) are presently the best opportunities for positive affective change. By implication, those programs of one quarter or one semester might be too short to permit an optimistic upswing after a "down" period and too long to sustain an initial impetus of high personal motivation. As this project eventually plans to continue measurement after a two year and a four year interval following the student's return from off-campus study, it will be extremely helpful to see if both time duration

groups remain significant or if the "10 weeks or less" group proves to be of immediate impact only.

Concerning the tentative results apropos of the geographical location of the off-campus experience, one would hypothesize that such findings would likely emerge. Logically, experience in a culture quite similar to the student's own would probably affect less change than experience in a culture radically different. Thus, students studying in Europe indicated fewer favorable responses than those staying in Central and South America, the Middle East, and Africa. These findings surely do not, at this point, imply the abolition of study programs in Europe. Rather, these results indicate what kind of outcomes may be expected in students choosing various geographical areas. Further, desired affective changes cannot be divorced from desired academic opportunities. Obviously, the total impact of a program in Africa should differ from that of a program in Western Europe or New York City. Program directors and those administrators making policy decisions would surely profit in knowing the direction and intensity of affective changes which are likely to occur in specific programs.

Finally, the lack of systematic differences, to this point, based on the presence or absence of a host family or roommate is really not astounding after some consideration. Rather than the presence or absence of the two factors, the quality of the relationship between the American student and the host family or the roommate appears significant. In the latter instance, there is a correlation between the quality of the relationship between the roommates and the major field of study of the individuals. Data will be clearer on the quality of these relationships in phase II.

Again, one must caution that these initial findings are tentative. The IOI as a measuring instrument is still in experimental development. Conversely, these early results are certainly interesting and, on occasion, arresting and provocative.

If the IOI proves successful at the end of phase II, the advantages of its availability would be numerous. Practically, an assessment instrument of off-campus study programs would probably be welcomed by those presently involved in the organization and direction of such programs. While control of selection criteria is explicitly not one of the goals of the IOI, predictions of student outcomes would prove immeasurably valuable. High school counsellors, undergraduate advisors and all foreign language people could begin to plan and to advise according to reliable information rather than according to guesses. Students could also know within certain limits what to expect of an off-campus program.

Second, those responsible for implementing off-campus study programs of specific natures would have an instrument capable of providing crucial information on which consequential decisions could be based. As an illustration, program administrators stressing fluency in a foreign language would know that the most beneficial results might be expected from a constellation of specific factors. Another program directed by a religiously oriented institution might want to devise a way to stress the development of tolerance and the development of the value system of the individual. In both cases, those specific values described as objectives might be more effectively measured with the use of the IOI. The process of implementing goals would be indicated by the comparison of the predictive scores on the measuring instrument before the student's departure and the ultimate scores upon return.

Third, the IOI would make a sortie into the domain of educational accountability. Federal and state governments, for example, have grown increasingly curious and aggressive in their demands for financial accounting and responsibility. This trend will not be reversed in the future, as higher education becomes more expensive, tax dollars rarer, and private contributions more selective. The golden age of higher education, symbolized by the formerly glib professorial attitude toward grants, is now a legend. From legislators counting tax dollars to parents footing the bills to students stepping into charter flights, the range of accountability is wide and its nature demanding.

As the Carnegie Commission has so convincingly demonstrated in many of its publications, assessment and accountability, now crucial concepts in education, will surely enter the permanent, professional lexicon. Thus the Individual Opinion Inventory is designed for those involved and concerned with off-campus education. If traditional natural boundaries dissolve and supranational or regional attitudes present new perspectives, the comprehension of the mechanisms of attitudinal change in students will become more and more significant. As the concept of a world view gains ascendancy, educators must afford students those experiences deemed most likely to be beneficial.

International Education: Research Bibliography

Center for the Study of Higher Education

W. Frank Hull IV, Director

Abrams, Irwin. "The Educated Traveler." Antioch Notes, XL (March, 1965).

_____. "Interinstitutional Cooperation in International Studies." Liberal Education, LIV (March, 1968).

Adwere-Bomah, Joseph. "African Intellectuals Abroad: Concerns and Commitments, A Study of Prospective Elite Perceptions and Commitments to Educational Change in Africa." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, 1970.

Aikman, Louis P., and Parker, Edmond T. "Using the Worldmindedness Scale in Cross Cultural Research: An Exploratory Study." An unpublished paper presented to the annual conference of New England Educational Research Organization, Hartford, Connecticut, May 12, 1972. ED 065 397.

Albores, S. "The Marginal Man: A Study in Culture Conflict." Paper presented at the Interdisciplinary Student Symposia on Culture Learning, Honolulu, May, 1971.

Althen, G. "Human Relations Training and Foreign Students." In: Hoopes, Readings in Inter-cultural Communication, Pittsburgh: Regional Council for International Education, 1969.

Anderson, Gilbert. "American Blacks ... Involvement in Educational Exchange," International Educational and Cultural Exchange, VIII (Fall, 1972), 25-31.

Aronson, John, et.al. "Basic Techniques for International Student Research," College and University, XLVII (Summer, 1972), 379-386.

Arum, Stephen. "International Matchmaker Extraordinaire; His Approaches to U.S.--Foreign Student Relations." International Educational and Cultural Exchange, V (Fall, 1969), 69-75.

Bae, Chong-Keun. "The Effect of Traditionalism on Social Adjustment and the Brain Drain: A Study of Korean Students at the University of Wisconsin." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Wisconsin, 1972.

Bailyn, Lotte and Herbert C. Kelman. "The Effects of a Year's Experience in America on the Self-Image of Scandinavians: A Preliminary Analysis of Reactions to a New Environment." Journal of Social Issues, XVIII, 1 (1962), 30-40.

- Bardis, Panos Demetrios. "Dating Attitudes and Patterns Among Foreign Students at Purdue University." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Purdue University (1955).
- Barrutia, Richard. "Study Abroad." Modern Language Journal, LV (April, 1971), 232-234.
- Basu, A. K., and Richard G. Ames. "Cross-Cultural Contact and Attitude Formation." Sociology and Social Research, LV (October, 1970), 5-16.
- Baumgartel, Howard. "The Training Group as a Miniature Society." Human Relations Training News, VI, 4 (Winter, 1962-1963), 4.
- Beals, Lester. "Experiment in International Education," Junior College Journal, XL (April, 1970), 35-37.
- Beals, Ralph L. "The Exchange of Persons: Research Developments." Educational Exchanges: Aspects of the American Experience. Washington, D.C.: National Research Council, 1956, 53-62.
- _____. "The Mexican Student Views the United States." The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, CCVC (September, 1954), 108-115.
- _____. and Norman D. Humphrey. No Frontier to Learning: The Mexican Student in the United States. Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press. 1957.
- Becker, Tamar. "Cultural Patterns and Nationalistic Commitment Among Foreign Students in the United States," Sociology and Social Research, LV (July, 1971), 467-481.
- Beebe, George A. "The Foreign Student in the New York City Area." New York: The Greater New York Council for Foreign Students, 1955.
- Beecher, Ward. "Scrambled Scene ... U.S. Students in Britain," International Educational and Cultural Exchange, VIII (Fall, 1972), 46-53.
- Bennett, John W. "Cross-Cultural Education Research and the Study of National Acculturation." Some Uses of Anthropology: Theoretical and Applied. Washington, D.C.: Anthropological Society, 1956.
- _____. "Misunderstandings in the Communication Between Japanese Students and Americans." Social Problems, III (1956), 243-256.
- _____. Herbert Passin, Robert K. McKnight. In Search of Identity: The Japanese Overseas Scholar in America and Japan. Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press, 1958.
- Berry, J. W. (ed.). "Directory of Cross-Cultural Psychological Research." International Journal of Psychology, III, 2 (1968), 137-148.

- Bevenssee, Fred, R. Don Cider, James E. Hamby, Jr. "Social Distance and the International Student." Unpublished Master's Thesis, University of Florida (1967).
- Bicknese, Gunther. "Juniors in Germany: Effects and Opinions. An Experimental Evaluation Through Student Polls." An unpublished report, Agnes Scott College, Decatur, Georgia, n.d. ED 042 390
- Bjerstedt, Ake. "Informational and Non-Informational Determinants of Nationality Stereotypes," The Journal of Social Issues, XVIII, I (1962), 24-29.
- Blegen, Theodore C. Counseling Foreign Students. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1950.
- Board of Foreign Scholarships. "Educational Exchange in the Seventies: Statements by the Board of Foreign Scholarships, August 1971." International Educational and Cultural Exchange, VII (Fall, 1971), 1-8.
- Bolton, C.K. "Training for Cross-Cultural Adjustment and Effectiveness." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Case Western Reserve University, 1967.
- Borque, Jane M. "Observations on Interaction of American and Foreign Students." American Foreign Language Teacher, II (October, 1971), 35-36.
- Bradfield, Leila A. "The Foreign Student at Penn State." Unpublished, unfinished manuscript, the Pennsylvania State University, ca. 1964.
- Breuder, Robert L. "Identified Problems of International Students Enrolled in Public Junior Colleges in Florida." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The Florida State University, 1972.
- Brickman, William W. "International Interchange in Higher Education: Europe and the United States, 1700-1900." Notre Dame Journal of Education, III (Spring, 1972), 10-21.
- Brumberg, Stephan F. ICED Data Bank on International Programs of Higher Educational Institutions: Technical and Final Report for Year of Research June 1, 1970 to May 31, 1971. New York: International Council for Educational Development, 1971.
- Bruner, Jerome S. and Howard V. Perlmutter. "Compatriot and Foreigner: A Study of Impression Formulation in Three Countries." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, LV (September, 1957), 253-261.
- Bureau of Social Science Research, American University. An Analysis of First Reports from Foreign Exchange Students: Academic Year 1951-1952. Educational Exchange Service, II-A, Department of State (March, 1953).
- Burn, Barbara B. "Changes and Exchanges in Higher Education: USA and Germany." International Educational and Cultural Exchange, VIII (Winter, 1972-73), 63-38.
- Byers, Philip P. "Asian Invasion of American Campuses: Why?" International Educational and Cultural Exchange, VI (Spring, 1971), 58-70.

- Carey, A.T. Colonial Students: A Study of the Social Adaptation of Colonial Students in London. London: Secker and Warburg, 1956.
- Carroll, Frances Laverne. Feasibility Study for Incorporating a Year Abroad in the Library Science Curriculum. Office of Education Project Number 7-G-070. Norman, Oklahoma: University of Oklahoma, 1969. ED 032 094.
- Carstairs, G. M. "Some Problems of Psychiatry in Patients from Alien Culture." The Lancet (June 7, 1958), 1217-1220.
- Chandrase Kharaiah, Kananur V. "Status of Foreign Student Advising in Canada." College and University, XLV (Winter, 1970), 134-137.
- China Institute in America. Survey of Chinese Students and Professionals in the United States, 1951. New York: China Institute, 1951.
- Chou, Frank Hua-Tsin. "A Study of the Foreign Student Program at the University of Georgia, 1948-1949 through 1958-1959." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Georgia (June, 1960).
- Chu, Goodwin C. "Friendship Patterns in Multi-Cultural Group: International Communication at the Personal Level." Paper presented at the International Communication Sessions, Annual Convention of the Association for Education in Journalism, Columbia, South Carolina, August, 1971. ED 069 012
- Churchill, Ruth. "The Effects of Antioch Education Abroad on Students' Attitudes." Unpublished paper, mimeographed, 1961.
- Cieslak, Edward C. "The Foreign Student in American Colleges: A Survey and Evaluation of Administrative Problems and Practices." Detroit: Wayne University Press, 1955.
- Clark, Violet Wuerfel. "Ghanaian Students in the U.S., 1959-1960." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Michigan (1963).
- Coelho, George V. Changing Images of America: A Study of Indian Students' Perceptions. Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1958.
- _____. "Personal Growth and Educational Development Through Working and Studying Abroad." Journal of Social Issues, XVIII (1962), 55-67.
- Cohen, Robert D. "African Students and the Negro-American: Past Relationships and a Recent Program." International Educational and Cultural Exchange, V (Fall, 1969), 76-85.
- _____. "The Function of a Co-National Group of Foreign Students in New York City." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Columbia University, 1971.
- Colacicco, Mary Grace. "A Comparison of Item Responses on MMPI by Selected American and Foreign Students." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Purdue University, 1970.

- College Entrance Examination Board. The Foreign Graduate Student: Priorities for Research and Action. A colloquium held at Wingspread, Racine, Wisconsin, June 16-17, 1970. New York: CEEB, 1971. ED 047 604.
- Committee on Educational Interchange Policy. "African Students in the United States: A Guide for Sponsors of Student Exchange Programs with Africa." New York: Institute of International Education, 1960.
- _____. "Chinese Students in the United States: 1948-1955." New York: Institute of International Education, 1956.
- _____. "College and University Programs of Academic Exchange: Suggestions for the Study of Exchanges of Students, Faculty and Short-Term Visitors". New York: Committee on Educational Interchange Policy, 1960.
- _____. "Educational Exchange in the Atlantic Area." Statement 19, New York: Institute of International Education, 1965.
- _____. "The Foreign Student: Exchangee or Immigrant?" New York: Institute of International Education, 1965.
- _____. "A Foreign Student Program for the Developing Countries During the Coming Decade." New York: Institute of International Education, 1962.
- _____. "The Goals of Student Exchange: An Analysis of Programs for Foreign Students." New York: Institute of International Education, 1955.
- _____. "Orientation of Foreign Students." New York: Institute of International Education, 1956.
- The Committee on the International Migration of Talent. The International Migration of High-Level Manpower: It's Impact on the Development Process. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1970.
- Cook, Stuart W., and Claire Selltiz. "Some Factors Which Influence the Attitudinal Outcome of Personal Contact." International Social Science Bulletin, VII (1955), 51-58.
- _____, Joan Havel, and June R. Christ. The Effects of an Orientation Program for Foreign Students. New York: Research Center for Human Relations, New York University, 1957.
- Copen, Melvyn R., ed. Improving the Latin-American Business Student's Experience in the U.S. University. Washington, D.C.: National Association for Foreign Student Affairs, 1971. ED 047 610.
- Cormack, Margaret L. International Development Through Educational Exchange. Washington, D.C.: American Educational Research Assoc., 1968. ED 023 334.
- Cotner, Thomas E., ed. International Educational Exchange: A Selected Bibliography. Wash., D.C.: U.S. Department of HEW, 1961. (ED 025 976)

- Cowan, Susie. English Proficiency and Bicultural Attitudes of Japanese Students. Tokyo, Japan: The Taishukan Publishing Co., Ltd., 1968.
ED 027 529
- Coyne, John. "Undergrads Abroad in Africa." Change, V (March, 1973), 24-26.
- Culture Shock: An Exploration in Observation. Phi Delta Kappa, n.p., n.d. (ca. 1966).
- Daly, Lloyd W. "Roman Study Abroad." American Journal of Philology, LXXI (1950), 40-58.
- Daniels, Wayne. "Counseling Foreign Students." Report of the 1961 Workshop of Asian Cultures and Educational Exchange. C. L. Simerville and L. Ziegler (eds.). NAFSA Publication (General Series 6), 1961.
- Davis, F. James. "The Two-Way Mirror and the U-Curve: America as Seen by Turkish Students Returned Home." Sociology and Social Research LVI (October, 1971), 21-43.
- Davis, James M. "Foreign Students in the Two-Year College." International Educational and Cultural Exchange, VII (Fall, 1971), 25-32.
- _____, Russell, G. Hanson, Duane R. Burnor. IIE Survey of the African Student: His Achievements and His Problems. New York: Institute of International Education, 1961.
- Dawes, Norman. A Two-Way Street. New York: Asia Publishing House, 1962.
- Day, Jerry Richard. "A Study of the Differential Effects of Length of Time in the United States on Foreign Graduate and Undergraduate Students with Regard to the Number, Severity, and Category Groupings of Problems He Experiences." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Oklahoma State University, 1968.
- Deluga, Marvin Raymond. "An Analysis of the Selection Procedures of Foreign Students, at the Undergraduate Level, in the United States." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Idaho.
- Desmond, Richard L. and Patricia O. White. "The National Student Exchange." College Board Review, (Winter, 1972-73), 19-20, 33-34.
- Deutsch, Steven E. and George Y. M. Won. "Some Factors in the Adjustment of Foreign Nationals in the U.S." Journal of Social Issues, XIX, 3 (1963), 115-122.
- Dias, Milagres Constancio Nepomoceno. "The Effect of Counseling on Adjustment of Foreign Students." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles, 1971.

- Din, Sheik Imam. "A Survey of Foreign Student Attitudes on Attending Institutes of Higher Learning in the United States." Unpublished master's thesis, San Francisco State College, San Francisco, California, 1969.
- Dominques, Patricia M. "Student Personnel Services for International Students." National Association of Women Deans and Counselors Journal, XXXIII (Winter, 1970), 82-89.
- Doob, L. Resolving Conflict in Africa: The Fermeda Workshop. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1970.
- Dorai, Gopalakrishnan Chidambaram. "Economics of the International Flow of Students: A Cost-Benefit Analysis." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Wayne State University, 1962.
- Dremuk, Richard and James Frey. "Report on Feasibility for Foreign Credential Evaluation Service." College and University, XLIV (Summer, 1969), 414-418.
- DuBois, Cora. Foreign Students and Higher Education in the United States. Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, 1956.
- _____. "Research in Cross-Cultural Education." News Bulletin, XXVIII, 9 (1953), 5-8, 60-64.
- Duijker, H. C. J. and N. H. Frijda. National Character and National Stereotypes. Amsterdam: North-Holland Publishing Company, 1960.
- Duffy, Christopher G. "Individualized Overseas Program for Undergraduates," International Educational and Cultural Exchange, VII (Summer, 1971), 40-45.
- Dyresen, Dyre. "Non-Sponsored Study Abroad, Any Credit?" College and University, XLIV (Summer, 1969), 515-517.
- Eberhard, Wolfram. "Problems of Students Returning to Asia." International Educational and Cultural Exchange, V (Spring, 1970), 41-49.
- Eddy, John. "Factors and Guidelines in Foreign Student Grievance". Journal of College Student Personnel, XIII (May, 1972), 252-254.
- Eggertsen, Claude A. "An Evaluation of Study for the University of Michigan Teacher Candidates at the University of Sheffield, England." The University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan. October 13, 1969. U.S. Dept. of HEW, Office of Education, Bureau of Research. (ED 033 920)
- Eide, Ingrid. (ed.) Students as Links Between Cultures: A Cross-Cultural Survey Based on UNESCO Studies. Oslo, Norway: Scandinavian University Books, 1970.
- Ellakany, Farouk Abdelhamid Ahmed. "Prediction of Academic Achievement of Foreign Students at Iowa State University 1969-1970." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Iowa State University, 1970.

- Elliott, F. George. "The Dilemma of Foreign Student Admissions." Junior College Journal, XL (October, 1969), 17-20.
- English Language Institute. "A Comparison of Scores on the ELI English Proficiency Test with First Semester Grade Point Averages for 599 Foreign Students at the University of Michigan." University of Michigan, 1959.
- Enright, John B. and Walter R. Jaeckle. "Psychiatric Symptoms and Diagnosis in Two Subcultures." International Journal of Social Psychiatry, IX, 1 (1963), 12-17.
- Erickson, Douglas Eugene. "Differential Personality, Academic, and Biographical Characteristics of International Graduate Students at the University of North Dakota." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, The University of North Dakota, 1970.
- "An Exchange Program in Teacher Education for British and American Students." 1971 AACTE International Education Award Entry, The School of Education, The University of Connecticut, 1971. Ed 051 103.
- "Faculty-Student International Exchange Program." 1971 AACTE International Education Award Entry, Eastern Michigan University, 1970. ED 053 060.
- Farnum, Hollis B. "Adjustment of Guest ("Foreign") Students at Penn State College." Unpublished Master's Thesis, The Pennsylvania State University, 1948.
- Federation of Regional Accrediting Commissions of Higher Education. "Evaluation of Overseas Study Programs: A Pilot Study Conducted by FRACHE-Spring, 1972." Washington, D.C.: 1972.
- "First Report of the Regional Conference of American Programs in Spain." Hispania, LIV (December, 1971), 876-882.
- Forstat, Reisha. "Adjustment Problems of International Students." Sociology and Social Research, XXXVI (1951), 25-30.
- Foster, R. Examples of Cross-Cultural Problems Encountered by Americans Working Overseas: An Instructor's Handbook. Human Resources Research Office, Technical Report 65-7, Alexandria, Virginia: George Washington University, 1965.
- _____, and J. Danielian. An Analysis of Human Relations Training and Its Implications for Overseas Performance. Human Resources Research Office, Technical Report 66-15, Alexandria, Virginia: George Washington University, 1966.
- Fraser, Stewart E. and William W. Brickman. A History of International and Comparative Education: Nineteenth Century Documents. Chicago: Scott Foresman and Company, 1968.
- Freeman, Stephen A. Undergraduate Study Abroad: U.S. College-Sponsored Programs. New York: The Institute of International Education, 1966.

- French, Peter L. "January in Kenya: Enriching Field Seminar." International Educational and Cultural Exchange, VIII (Spring, 1973), 1-13.
- Garraty, John A. and Walter Adams. From Main Street to the Left Bank: Students and Scholars Abroad. East Lansing: Mich. State University Press, 1959.
- Garrison, Karl C. "Worldminded Attitudes of College Students in a Southern University." Journal of Social Psychology, LIV (1961), 147-153.
- "Germany As We Saw It: Third Edition, 1963." A report presented by the participants in the 1963 NDEA Advanced German Institute held by Stanford University at Bad Ball, Germany, Stanford University, 1963. ED 027 786.
- Gerritz, E. M., et al. "Evaluation of Credentials from Brazil, Columbia, Venezuela, and Central America." College and University, XLIV (Summer, 1969), 578-585.
- _____. "Rationale for International Students I." College and University, XLV (Summer, 1970), 530-544.
- Gezi, Khalil Ismail. "The Acculturation of Middle Eastern Arab Students in Selected American Colleges and Universities." New York: American Friends of the Middle East, 1959.
- _____. "Factors Associated with Student Adjustment in Crosscultural Contact." California Journal of Educational Research. XVI (1965).
- Gilletly, James Frederick. "The Public Junior College in International Education." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, 1973.
- Glaser, David. "Vietnam and the University: University of Maryland's Far East Division." Improving College and University Teaching, IX (Autumn, 1971), 280-283.
- Golden, Joshua S. "Student Adjustment Abroad: A Psychiatrist's View." International Educational and Cultural Exchange, VIII (Spring, 1973), 28-36.
- Goldsen, Rose K., Edward Suchman, Robin M. Williams. "Factors Associated with the Development of Cross-Cultural Interaction." Journal of Social Issues, XII, 1 (1956), 26-32.
- Gorden, Raymond L. American Guests in Columbian Homes: A Study in Cross-Cultural Communications. Washington: U.S. Office of Education, n.n.
- Gough, Harrison G. and William A. McCormack. "An Exploratory Evaluation of Education Abroad." Cooperative Research Project No. S-440. Unpublished research report, University of California, Berkeley, California, 1967.
- Grafton, Clive L. "Foreign Student Patterns in American Community Colleges." Junior College Journal, XL (March, 1970), 32-33.

- Grand Pre, Conn R. "Window on America." International Educational and Cultural Exchange, VI (Fall, 1970) 86-93.
- Green, Eleanor Kuhlman. "A Study of the Structure and Interaction of a Group of Turkish Students at the University of Florida, October, 1952, to June, 1953." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Florida, 1956.
- Greenblat, Cathy Stein. "Orientation to Modernization and the Sojourn Experience: A Study of Foreign Students From Four Developing Countries." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Columbia University, 1968.
- Group for the Advancement of Psychiatry. "Application of Psychiatric Insights to Cross-Cultural Communication." Symposium 7, New York, 1961.
- _____. "Working Abroad: A Discussion of Psychological Attitudes and Adaptation in New Situations." New York, 1958.
- Guidelines: Initial Orientation of Foreign Students. Cleveland, Ohio: The National Association for Foreign Student Affairs Field Service Program, 1964. ED 024 964.
- Gullahorn, John T. and Jeanne E. Gullahorn. American Students in France. International Educational Exchange Series, U.S. Department of State, 1955.
- _____. "An Extension of the U-Curve Hypothesis." Journal of Social Issues, XIX, 3 (1963), 33-47.
- _____. "International Educational Exchange: An Assessment of Professional and Social Contributions by American Fulbright and Smith-Mundt Grantees, 1947-1957. Department of State (July, 1960).
- Gunderson, Orley D. "Off to Europe's Workshops and Labs," American Vocational Journal, XLVII (December, 1972), 58-60.
- Guthrie, George M. and Richard E. Spencer. "American Professions and Overseas Technical Assistance." University Park: The Institute of Public Administration, The Pennsylvania State University, 1965.
- Guyer, David L. "International Student and Faculty Exchange, 1968-69." School and Society, XCVIII (March, 1970), 178-180.
- Haass, G. James, et al. "Foreign Student Admissions 101." College and University, XLV (Summer, 1970), 830-835.
- Hagey, A. R., and Joan Hagey. "The International Student and the Junior College: Academic and Social Needs." Journal of College Student Personnel, XIII (March, 1972), 140-144.
- Hague, Fred R. "American Field Service Exchange Students, 1963-1964: The effects of Certain Variables Upon Their Attitudes Toward Selected Aspects of American Society." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Pittsburgh, 1964.

- Halasz, Sarl C. "University of California, Los Angeles Study II: Graduate Students from Indonesia, Korea, Pakistan and Thailand: Fall 1959 through Spring 1967." College and University, XLV (Fall, 1969), 44-54.
- Hanson, Harlan P. "The International Baccalaureate," International Educational and Cultural Exchange, VII (Summer, 1971), 10-14.
- Harari, Maurice. "Priorities for Research and Action in the Graduate Foreign Student Field." International Educational and Cultural Exchange, VI (Fall, 1970), 60-67.
- Heath, G. Louis. "Berkeley's Community Programs for International Students." International Educational and Cultural Exchange, V (Summer, 1969), 30-34.
- _____. "The Lodestar International Student Experiment." School and Society, XCVII (October, 1969), 372-374.
- Heise, Jon Otis. "Relationship of Foreign Students' Educational and Vocational Values to Background Variables and Perceived Institutional Press." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Stanford University, 1971.
- Heisler, Mary Kathryn. "Factors Which Differentiate United States Students Who Wish to Study in Cross-Cultural Educational Programs." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Oregon State University, 1973.
- Henry, David D. "The Latin American Scholarship Program of American Universities." International Educational and Cultural Exchange, VII (Winter, 1972), 30-55.
- Herman, Simon N. American Students In Israel. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1970.
- Hertelendy, Martha Margaret. "Survey of Foreign Students in the School of Education at San Francisco State College." Unpublished master's thesis, San Francisco State College, San Francisco, California.
- Hilton, Lynn M. "Foreign Study League." International Educational and Cultural Exchange, VI (Winter, 1971), 30-37.
- Hinkle, Rodney J. "A Geo-Political Critique of Study Abroad." International Education, II (Fall, 1972), 74-79.
- Ho, Man Keung. "The Effect of Group Counseling on the Academic Performance, Study Habits and Attitudes, and the Interpersonal Adjustment of Foreign Students." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The Florida State University, 1969.
- Hoopes, David S. and Stephen H. Rhinesmith. "Report of the Cross-Cultural Communications Workwhop." Human Relations Training News, XI, 1 (1967), 3-6.

- Hope, Lucien W. (ed.). The Student in the International Scene: Abstracts, International Education Year Conference. Washington, D.C.: National Association for Foreign Student Affairs, 1970.
- Houstras, Peter Timothy. "The Relationship Between Pre-Admission Data and the Achievement of Foreign Graduate Students." Journal of Educational Psychology, XXXVIII, 3 (March, 1957), 157-163.
- Hull, W. Frank IV. "Changes in World-Mindedness After a Cross-Cultural Sensitivity Group Experience." The Journal of Applied Behavioral Sciences. VIII, 1 (1972), 115-121.
- _____. "The Influence of a Random Sample of International Students Upon American Students in a Sensitivity Group Experience." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, The Pennsylvania State University, 1970.
- Humphrey, Norman D. "The Mexican Image of Americans." The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, CCLXXXV (September, 1954), 116-125.
- Hwang, Kwo-Yann. "Predictive Validity of the Test of English as a Foreign Language for Chinese Graduate Students at an American University." Educational and Psychological Measurement, XXX (Summer, 1970), 475-477.
- Ibrahim, Saad E. M. "Interaction, Perception, and Attitudes of Arab Students Toward Americans." Sociology and Social Research, LV (October, 1970), 29-46.
- Inkeles, Alex and Daniel J. Levinson. "National Character: The Study of Modal Personality and Sociocultural Systems." Gardner Lindzey (ed.). Handbook of Social Psychology, II. Cambridge: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Inc. (1954), 977-1020.
- Institute of African American Relations. "Views of African Students on Strengthening African-American Relations." Washington, D.C., n.d. (ca. 1956).
- Institute of International Education. Report of the National Conference on Exchange of Persons. New York (February, 1955).
- Institute of Research on Overseas Programs, Michigan State University. The International Programs of American Universities: An Inventory and Analysis. East Lansing: Michigan State University, 1958.
- International Exchange-1968: A Report of the Bureau of Education and Cultural Affairs, Department of State. International Information and Cultural Series 99. Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs, Department of State, 1969.
- International Liaison Office, Waseda University: Self-Study of International Educational Exchange. Tokyo: Waseda University, 1972.

- International Research Associates, Inc. "Italian Exchangees: A Study in Attitude Change and Diffusion." Department of State (March, 1955).
- _____. "A Study of Reactions to the State Department Exchange Program Among Returned Mexican Grantees." Mexico (January, 1959).
- Jacobson, Eugene H. "Sojourn Research: A Definition of the Field." Journal of Social Issues, XIX, 3 (1963), 123-129.
- _____. Hideya, Kumata, Jeanne E. Gullahorn. "Cross-Cultural Contributions to Attitude Research." Public Opinion Quarterly, XXIV (1960), 205-223.
- Jacqz, Jane W. African Students at U. S. Universities: Report of a Conference on the Admission and Guidance of African Students held at Howard University, Washington, D.C., March 17-18, 1967. New York: African-American Institute, 1967.
- Jaekel, Hugo. "Ships and Students at Sea." International Educational and Cultural Exchange, V (Spring, 1970), 68-83.
- Jarrahi-Zadeh, Ali, and William J. Eichman. "The Impact of Sociocultural Factors on Middle-Eastern Students in the U. S." International Educational and Cultural Exchange, V (Winter, 1970), 82-94.
- Joel, Mildred, et al. "Non-Sponsored Study Abroad: How to Evaluate," College and University, XLVII (Summer, 1972), 707-711.
- Johnson, Alan W. "Costs of International Education: Who Pays?" International Educational and Cultural Exchange, VI (Spring, 1971), 32-42.
- Johnson, Dixon C. "Asian Alumni Look Back on Their American Experiences." International Educational and Cultural Exchange, VI (Summer, 1970), 77-81.
- _____. "Problems of Foreign Students." International Educational and Cultural Exchange, VII (Fall, 1971), 61-68.
- Johnson, Glenda. "Black Student Abroad." International Educational and Cultural Exchange, VI (Winter, 1971), 1-6.
- Jones, Alfred E. American Members of the Inns of Court. London: The Saint Catherine Press, 1924.
- Kafka, Eric Philip. "The Effects of Overseas Study on Worldmindedness and Other Selected Variables of Liberal Arts Students." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1968.
- Kamel, M. Moghrabi. "An Analysis of Factors that Influence the Degree of Success or Failure of Foreign Students at Texas A.&M. University." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Texas A. & M. University, 1966.

- Kaplan, Robert B. "NAFSA in the Mod Mod World." International Educational and Cultural Exchange, VI (Fall, 1970), 68-75.
- Kelman, Herbert C. "Changing Attitudes Through International Activities." Journal of Social Issues, XVIII, 1 (1962), 68-87.
- _____. "The Reactions of Participants in a Foreign Specialists Seminar to their American Experience." Journal of Social Issues, XIX, 3 (1963), 61-114.
- _____. and Lotte Bailyn. "Effects of Cross-Cultural Experience on National Images: A Study of Scandinavian Students in America." Journal of Conflict Resolution, VI (1962), 319-334.
- Kidder, Louise Margaret Hoch. "Foreign Visitors: A Study in the Changes in Selves, Skills, and Attitudes of Westerners in India." Unpublished doctor dissertation, Northwestern University, 1971.
- Kiell, Norman. "Attitudes of Foreign Students." Journal of Higher Education, XXII (1951), 188-194, 225.
- Kincaid, Harry V. A Preliminary Study of the Goals and Problems of the Foreign Student in the U. S. Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs, Department of State (December, 1961).
- Kirstein, Laurette. "Community Services for Foreign Students in Metropolitan Areas." International Educational and Cultural Exchange, VI (Winter, 1971), 55-61.
- Klassen, Frank H., et al. The International Dimension of American Teacher Education: A Survey of International Education Programs of American Colleges and Universities. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1972.
- Klein, Marjorie H., et al. "Foreign Student Adaptation Program: Social Experiences of Asian Students in the U.S." International Educational and Cultural Exchange, VI (Winter, 1971), 77-90.
- Klineberg, Otto, Tensions Affecting International Understanding: A Survey of Research, New York: Social Science Research Council, 1950.
- Knowlton, M. and D. Bianco. "A Proposal: An Institute of International Life at Boston University." Journal of Education, CLII (1970), 35-49.
- Koo, May. "American Students' Contacts With and Attitudes Toward Foreign Students." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Michigan State University, 1962.
- Krajewski, Frank Richard. "A Study of the Relationship of an Overseas-Experienced Population Based on Sponsorship of Parent and Subsequent Academic Adjustment to College in the United States." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1969.

- Kwochka, Vera Faith. "A Survey of United States Students Regarding the Effects of their Residence in the International House of New York." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Columbia University, 1970.
- LaConte, Ronald T. and Christine LaConte. "Work-Study Exchange for British and American Student Teachers." Educational Leadership, XXVII (November, 1969), 137-139.
- Lakin, Martin. "International Education in the Netherlands." Intellect, CI (January, 1973), 245-246.
- _____ and Harold Schiffman. "Sensitivity Training and Interracial Communication." Training News, X, 3 (1966), 2.
- Lambert, R. S. (ed.). Grand Tour: A Journey in the Tracks of the Age of Aristocracy. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., Inc., 1937.
- Lambert, Richard D. and Martin Bressler. "An American Education for Students from India." Journal of Higher Education, XXVI (1955), 125-133, 171.
- _____. Indian Students on an American Campus. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 1956.
- _____. "Indian Students and the United States: Cross-Cultural Images." The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, CCLXXXV (September, 1954), 62-72.
- _____. "The Sensitive-Area Complex: A Contribution to the Theory of Guided Culture Contact." American Journal of Sociology, LX (1955), 583-592.
- Lambert, Wallace E. and Otto Klineberg. Children's Views of Foreign Peoples: A Cross-National Study. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1967.
- Lara, E. V. "Effects of Previous Study of English on the Academic Performance of 40 Foreign Students." University of Kansas, International Student Studies #17 (1966).
- Lentz, Theo F. "The Attitude of World Citizenship." Journal of Social Psychology, XXXII (1950), 207-214.
- Leonard, Elizabeth Waugh. "Selected General Education Outcomes of a Foreign Travel and Study Program." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The Pennsylvania State University, 1959.
- Leonard, Olen E. and Sheldon G. Lowry. "International Exchange of Persons." Rural Social Systems and Adult Education. Charles P. Loomis, et al. (eds.). East Lansing: Michigan State College Press, 1953, 244-270.
- Longest, James W. Evaluating Orientation for Foreign Students. Cornell International Agricultural Development Mimeograph 27. Ithaca, New York: New York State College of Agriculture at Cornell University, 1969.

- Loomis, Charles P. and Edgar A. Schuler. "Acculturation of Foreign Students in the U. S." Applied Anthropology, VII (1948), 17-34.
- Lysgaard, Sverre. "Adjustment in a Foreign Society: Norwegian Fulbright Grantees Visiting the U. S." International Social Science Bulletin, VII (1955), 45-51.
- Maretzki, T. "Transition Training: A Theoretical Approach." Human Organization, XXIV (1965), 128-134.
- Martin, Gale McLane. "A Model for the Cultural and Statistical Analysis of Academic Achievement of Foreign Graduate Students at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 1971.
- Masters, Roger D. "Toward Improved Franco-American University Exchanges." International Educational and Cultural Exchange, VII (Winter, 1972), 7-15.
- Matthewson, Douglas E., Jr. A National Survey of International Students and Programs in Community Junior Colleges in the United States. Washington, D.C.: National Association for Foreign Students Affairs Junior College Committee, 1968.
- McGuigan, F. J. "Psychological Changes Related to Intercultural Experiences." Psychological Reports, IV (1958), 55-60.
- Melby, John F. and Elinor K. Wolf. Looking Glass for Americans: A Study of Foreign Students at the University of Pennsylvania. New York: National Council on Asian Affairs, Inc., 1961.
- Metraux, Guy S. "Cross-Cultural Education Through the Ages." International Education: A Document History. David G. Scanlon (ed.). New York: Teachers College Columbia University, 1960, 124-137.
- _____. Exchange of Persons: The Evolution of Cross-Cultural Education. New York: Social Science Research Council, 1952.
- Michielli, James A. "American Students in Foreign Countries: Students Abroad Studying Their Own Thing." Improving College and University Teaching, XX (Summer, 1972), 160-161.
- _____. "The Study Abroad Advisor on Campus: An Expanding Role." International Educational and Cultural Exchange, V (Summer, 1969), 49-54.
- Mill, C. and J. Clee. Assessment of Intercultural Experience of Asian Visitors to the United States of America. Washington, D.C.: National Training Laboratories, 1966.
- Miller, Milton H., Margorie H. Klein, A. A. Alexander. "Foreign Student Adaptation Project." A Report in Progress at Wisconsin Psychiatric Institute and the University of Wisconsin Medical Center (Fall, 1968).

- Miller, Richard Eugene. "A Study of Significant Elements in the On-The-Job Behavior of College and University Foreign Student Advisers." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1968.
- Mishler, Anita L. "Personal Contact in International Exchanges." International Behavior: A Social-Psychological Analysis. H. C. Kelman (ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1966.
- Moore, Forrest G. "International Education in the Seventies: Revolution or Turmoil on the Campus." International Educational and Cultural Exchange, VI (Summer, 1970), 34-47.
- Moos, Rudolf H. "Psychological Techniques in the Assessment of Adaptive Behavior." Unpublished report, Stanford University School of Medicine, Stanford, n. n.
- Morgan, Edward E., Jr. "The Adjustment Problems of African Students in the United States." Unpublished Master's Paper, The Pennsylvania State University, 1965.
- _____. "The American College Student in Switzerland: A Study of Cross-Cultural Adaptation and Change." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Pittsburgh, 1972.
- Morris, Richard T. "National Status and Attitudes of Foreign Students." Journal of Social Issues, XII (1956), 20-25.
- _____. The Two-Way Mirror: National Status in Foreign Students' Adjustment. Minneapolis: The University of Minnesota Press, 1960.
- Mueller, Sherry Lee. "Exploring America With a Group of Asian and Pacific Student Leaders." International Educational and Cultural Exchange, VI (Spring, 1971), 1-16.
- National Tsing Hua University Research Fellowship Fund and the China Institute in America. "A Survey of Chinese Students in American Universities and Colleges in the Past 100 Years." New York, 1954.
- Nelson, Donald N., et al. "We Studied Abroad." College and University, XLVII (Summer, 1972), 288-291.
- Nelson, Robert L. "The Psychiatric Needs of Foreign Students." IIE Bulletin, XXXIII, 9 (May, 1958), 13-17.
- _____. The Use of Psychiatric Facilities in a University Setting by Foreign Students. Cambridge: University Health Services, 1956.
- Neufield, Gerald G. "How Personality, Foreign Language Aptitude, and Anomie Relate to Foreign Language Acquisition." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, 1969.
- "New Overseas Study Programs for Future Teachers." School and Society, XCVIII (April, 1970), 210, 228.

- Nielsen, Waldemar A., William Cullen Bryant II, Donald W. Wyatt. "Our African Students." Overseas, I, 6, (February, 1962), 15-19.
- Niyekawa, Agnes M. "Adjustment Problems of Male Students from Japan in Hawaii." Romanzo Adam Social Research Laboratory, University of Hawaii, 1952.
- O'Bannon, George W. "Project Afghanistan: Undergraduates in Dynamic Cross-Cultural Experiment." International Educational and Cultural Exchange, VIII (Spring, 1973), 14-20.
- O'Hara, Barratt. African Students and Study Programs in the United States. House Report 809 (August, 1965). House of Representatives, 89th Congress, 1st Session.
- Oldt, Esther A. "Antioch Education Abroad: An Evaluation" Antioch College Reports, 10 (May, 1969).
- Operations and Policy Research. Foreign Students in the United States: A National Survey, I, II. Washington, D.C., 1966.
- Orr, James Darby. "The Foreign Scholar Returned Home: A Review of Selected Research." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Columbia University, 1971.
- Ottis, Jack. "Psychotherapy with Foreign Students in a University." Mental Hygiene, XXXIX, 4 (October, 1955), 581-597.
- Pace, C.R. The Junior Year in France: An Evaluation of the University of Delaware - Sweet Brian College Program. Syracuse, N.Y.: Syracuse University Press, 1959.
- Passin, Herbert and John Bennett. "The American-Educated Japanese, I -- The Student in America: Theory, Background, Images." The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, CCLXXXV (September, 1954), 83-96.
- _____. "The American-Educated Japanese, II -- Images After Return to Japan; Conclusions." The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, CCLXXXV (September, 1954), 97-107.
- Peterson, James A. and Martin H. Neumeyer. "Problems of Foreign Students." Sociology and Social Research. XXXII (1948), 787-792.
- Pfister, Allen O. "The Evaluation of Overseas Study Programs: Two Case Studies." The North Central Association Quarterly, XLVI (Fall, 1971), 307-313.
- _____. "The Evaluation of Study Abroad Programs Under the Auspices of American Colleges and Universities: U.S. Regional Accrediting Agencies Look at Study Abroad." Occasional Papers in Higher Education, No. 2, School of Education, University of Denver, December, 1972.

- _____. "Evaluation of Undergraduate Programs: In what Way Should Evaluation of Overseas Study Programs Be Included in the Accreditation Process for Colleges and Universities?" Paper presented at the Annual Membership Conference of the Council on International Exchange, Tarrytown, New York, November 21, 1969.
- _____. "Everyone Overseas! Goshen College Pioneers," International Educational and Cultural Exchange, VIII (Fall, 1972), 1-12.
- _____. General Evaluation of Study Abroad Programs Under the Auspices of American Colleges and Universities. Paper presented at the meeting of the National Association for Foreign Student Affairs, Atlanta, May 3, 1972.
- _____. "Quality Control for Study Abroad Programs." International Educational and Cultural Exchange, VIII (Winter, 1972-73), 19-36.
- Phelps-Stokes Fund. "A Survey of African Students Studying in the United States." New York, 1949.
- Pool, I. S. "Effects of Cross-National Contact on National and International Images." In: Kelman H. International Behavior: A Social-Psychological Analysis. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1966.
- Pratt, Dallas. "Helping the Foreign Student in New York City: An Experiment in Brief Psychotherapy and Cultural Research." Bulletin of the World Federation of Mental Health, IV, 4 (November, 1952), 172-176.
- Punke, Harold H. "International Education and Degree Flexibility." Improving College and University Teaching, IX (Autumn, 1971), 275-277.
- Purkable, Ruth H. "American Students Abroad." International Educational and Cultural Exchange, VII (Winter, 1972), 30-55.
- Putman, Ivan, Jr. "The Academic Performance of Foreign Students." The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, CCCXXV (May, 1961), 42-53.
- Rainey, Mary Catherine. "Language Learnings of Overseas - Experienced American Teenagers." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1971.
- Rathorne, Naeem Gul. "The Pakistan Student: His Desire to Study in and Preconceptions of the United States. His Problems and Evaluation of His Experience in the United States and Upon Return to Pakistan." New York: American Friends of the Middle East, 1957.
- Rhinesmith, Stephen. "The Intercultural Workshop." Vidya, II (Spring, 1968), 87-89.
- Rich, Daniel. "Some Considerations Concerning Cross-Cultural Education." Unpublished master's thesis, University of Pittsburgh, 1966.
- Riegal, O. W. "Residual Effects of Exchange of Persons." Public Opinion Quarterly, XVII (1953), 319-327.

- Ritterband, Paul. The Non-Returning Foreign Student: The Israeli Case. Research Project No. 6-1273. New York: Bureau of Applied Social Research, Columbia University, 1968.
- Rogers, Kenneth A. Improving the Latin American Engineering Students' Experience in the U.S. University. Washington, D.C.: National Association for Foreign Student Affairs,, 1971.
- Rothwell, Kenneth J., ed. A Directory of Study Abroad Programs as Conducted by Colleges, Universities, and Institutions of Higher Learning in New England. International Studies Series. Durham, N.H.: New England Center for Continuing Education, 1970.
- Sampson, Donald L. and Howard Smith. "A Scale to Measure Worldminded Attitudes." Journal of Social Psychology, XXXV (1957), 99-106.
- Santos, Antusa Perez. "A Study of the Problems Faced by Foreign Students at Indiana University with Implications for Action." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Indiana University, 1959.
- Schenck, Ethel A. "Procedures for Inaugurating Sponsored Study Abroad Programs," College and University, XLVII (Summer, 1972), 594-604.
- _____. et.al., "Credit Recommendations for Study Abroad." College and University, XLV (Summer, 1970), 434-438.
- Schild, Erling O. "The Foreign Student, as Stranger, Learning the Norms of the Host-Culture." Journal of Social Issues, XVIII, 1 (1962), 42-54.
- Schulken, Emma Walker. "A History of Foreign Students in American Higher Education From Its Colonial Beginnings to the Present: A Synthesis of the Major Forces Influencing Their Presence in American Higher Education." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The Florida State University, 1968.
- Schwaneger, Henry. "The Junior Year Abroad: Then, Now, and ?" Unter-richtsprax, III (Spring, 1970), 154-159.
- Schwantes, Robert S. "Results of Study Abroad: Japanese Students in America, 1865-1885." School and Society, LXXII (1950), 375-376.

Scott, Franklin D. The American Experience of Swedish Students. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1956.

_____. "The Swedish Students' Image of the United States." The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, CCLXXXV (September, 1954), 136-145.

Seashore, Charles. "An Evaluation of Staff Development and Human Relations Workshops Conducted by the Ford Foundation in West Africa, 1961-1963." Washington, D. C.: National Training Laboratories, 1965.

Selby, Henry A. and Clyde M. Woods. "Foreign Students at a High-Pressure University." Sociology of Education, XXXIX, 2 (Spring, 1966), 138-154.

_____. Foreign Student Study. Stanford University. n.d. (ca. 1965).

Self-Study of International Educational Exchange. Berkeley: University of California, 1970.

Selltiz, Claire, Anna Lee Hopson, Stuart W. Cook. "The Effects of Situational Factors on Personal Interaction Between Foreign Students and Americans." Journal of Social Issues, XII, 1 (1956), 33-44.

_____. June R. Christ, Joan Havel, Stuart W. Cook. Attitudes and Social Relations of Foreign Students in the United States. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1963.

_____. and Stuart W. Cook. "Factors Influencing Attitudes of Foreign Students Toward the Host Country." Journal of Social Issues XVIII, 1 (1962), 7-23.

Sewell, William H., and Oluf M. Davidsen. "The Adjustment of Scandinavian Students." Journal of Social Issues, XII, 1 (1956), 9-19.

_____. Richard T. Morris, Oluf M. Davidsen. "Scandinavian Students' Images of the United States: A Study in Cross-Cultural Education." The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, CCLXXXV (September, 1954), 126-135.

Shaffer, Robert H. and Leo R. Dowling. Foreign Students and Their American Student Friends. Unpublished Study, University of Indiana, 1966.

Shaw, M. and J. Wright. Scales for the Measurement of Attitudes. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967.

Shearer, Roberta. "A Comparative Study of American Graduate Student Friends of Foreign Students." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Indiana University, 1965.

- Shepard, Nolan Edgbert. "The Acculturation of Foreign Students in Southern Colleges and Universities." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Mississippi, 1970.
- Shrilbert, Arthur Jacob. "The Interpersonal Environments of the Residents of an International Student Dormitory." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Columbia University, 1972.
- Sims, Albert G. "The Foreign Graduate Student." International Educational and Cultural Exchange, V (Fall, 1969), 86-87.
- Sinaver, Ernst M. The Role of Communication in International Training and Education: Overcoming Barriers to Understanding With the Developing Countries. New York: Fredrick A. Praeger, Publishers, 1967.
- Sjogren, Cliff. "Evaluation of Education Credentials from Turkey and the United Arab Republic." College and University, XLIV (Summer, 1969), 418-421.
- Sloan, Ruth C. "African Students in the United States." IIE News Bulletin, XXIX, 6 (March, 1954).
- Smart, Reginald. "The Goals and Definitions of International Education: An Agenda for Discussion," International Studies Quarterly, XV (December, 1971), 442-464.
- _____. "Tune In, Turn On, But Don't Drop Out: An Approach to Orientation for Study Abroad," International Educational and Cultural Exchange, VII (Summer, 1971), 54-60.
- Smiley, Joseph R. "Impact of Foreign Students on American Campuses." NAFSA Newsletter, XIX, 8 (May, 1968).
- Smith, Charles Thomas, Jr. "The Relationship of Program Characteristics of the Kalamazoo College Foreign Study Programs to Changes in Participants' Attitudes, Values, or Interests." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Michigan, 1970.
- Smith, Howard Persifor. "Changes in Attitude Resulting from Experiences in Foreign Countries." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Howard University, 1954.
- _____. "Do Intercultural Experiences Affect Attitudes?" Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, LI (1955), 467-477.
- _____. and Ellen Weber Rosen. "Some Psychological Correlates of Worldmindedness and Authoritarianism." Journal of Personality, XXVI (1958), 170-183.
- Smith, M. Brewster. "Cross-Cultural Education as a Research Area." Journal of Social Issues, XII, 1 (1956), 3-8.

- _____. "Peace Corps Teachers in Ghana." Berkeley: University of California, Institute of Human Development, 1964.
- _____. "A Perspective for Further Research on Cross-Cultural Education." Journal of Social Issues, XII (1956), 56-68.
- _____. "Research in the Field of International Education." Handbook on International Study. New York: Institute of International Education, 1955, 235-252.
- _____. "Some Features of Foreign Student Adjustment." Journal of Higher Education, XXVI (1955), 231-241.
- Snipes, Paul David. "Communication Behavior and Personal Adjustment Among American and Foreign Students at Indiana University." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, 1969.
- Spencer, Richard E. and Ruth Awe. A Bibliography of Research on Foreign Student Affairs. New York: Institute of International Education, 1968.
- Spier, Paula. "Predictive Factors in Selection for an Overseas Study Program." Unpublished report, Antioch College, Yellow Springs, Ohio, June, 1968.
- Steering Committee, The Study of Education at Stanford. The Study of Education at Stanford, Report to the University, Study Abroad, Report IX. Stanford University, December, 1968.
- Stewart, E. American Cultural Patterns: A Cross-Cultural Perspective: Dimensions of International Education. Pittsburgh: The Regional Council for International Education, 1971.
- Stiles, Lindley J. "Policy and Perspective: An International Evaluation of Educational Achievement," The Journal of Educational Research, LXVI (December, 1972).
- Stokle, Norman. "The CIEE and Study Abroad: Purposes, Principles, and Programs." Foreign Language Annals, IV (March, 1971), 299-305.
- Stout, Anthony and Donald Nylen. "Applying Laboratory Principles in Designing an International Seminar." Training News, X, 2 (1966), 3.
- Straub, Jean S., Hugh M. Jenkins, and Ewa U. Eko. "Academic Freedom for International Students on American Campuses." National Association of Womens Deans and Counselors Journal, XXXIII (Winter, 1970), 77-81.
- "Study Service Abroad." Saturday Review, LII (October 18, 1969), 84.
- Sturmer, William F. "Reflections on Overseas Study Programs." International Educational and Cultural Exchange, VI (Fall, 1970), 45-59.

Sweeney, Leo J., et al. "Admission and Placement of Students From Australia--New Zealand--Hong Kong--Malaysia--Singapore." College and University, XLV (Summer, 1970), 843-849.

_____. "Admission and Placement of Students From Ceylon--India--Pakistan." College and University, XLV (Summer, 1970), 838-843.

Taba, Hilda. Cultural Attitudes and International Understanding: An Evaluation of an International Study Tour. New York: Institute of International Education. Occasional Paper, 1953.

Taylor, A. J. W. "Culture Conflict and Student Performance." International Journal of Social Psychiatry, XIII, 4 (Autumn, 1967), 307.

"Teaching Americanese to Japanese Teachers." School and Society, XCVIII (December, 1970), 464-465.

Thames, John Alsop. "Korean Students in Southern California: Factors Influencing Their Plans Toward Returning Home." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California, 1971.

Thomas, Alfred, Jr., et al. "Rationale for International Students: A Hidden Educational Resource." College and University, XLV (Summer, 1970), 622-625.

Thompson, Carol B. "International Programs: Communication or Obfuscation?" International Educational and Cultural Exchange, VII (Fall 1971), 75-80.

Tillinghast, B. S., Jr. "An Experimental Counseling Practicum in Mexico." Counselor Education and Supervision, X (Fall, 1970), 93-94.

Toscano, James V. "The Interim-Term World Campus," International Educational and Cultural Exchange, VIII (Summer, 1972), 23-32.

Training Foreign Nationals in the United States. Ann Arbor: The Foundation for Research on Human Behavior, 1956.

Trenka, C. "Some Aspects of Foreign Student Life in the United States." Unpublished master's thesis, American University, 1954.

Trevelyan, M. "Yesterday and Today: Thirty Years With International Students." International Educational and Cultural Exchange, VIII (Summer, 1972), 1-15.

Triandis, H., E. Davis, and S. Takezawa. "Some Determinants of Social Distance Among American, German, and Japanese Students." Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, II (1965), 110-118.

_____. and L. Triandis. "A Cross-Cultural Study of Social Distance." Psychological Monographs, LXXVI (1962).

Tschan, Robert E., et al. "Problems in Graduate Admissions of International Students." College and University, XLIV (Summer, 1969), 572-577.

_____. "Research on A.I.D. Sponsored Foreign Students." College and University, XLV (Summer, 1970), 717-723.

United States Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs. The Effectiveness of the Exchange Program: Africa, a Study in Seven African Countries (January 31, 1963).

_____. Foreign Students in the United States: A National Survey (September, 1966).

"The University of California Education Abroad Program: A Report on the First Ten Years to the Board of Regents." Unpublished report, University of California, n.p., June, 1972.

University of California: Self-Study of International Educational Exchange. University of California, 1970.

University, Government, and the Foreign Graduate Student: A Summary of the Colloquium on the Foreign Graduate Student, Held at Wingspread, Racine, Wisconsin, March 30-31, 1967. New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1969.

Unseem, John. "Images of the United States and Britain Held by Foreign-Educated Indians." The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, CCLXXXV (September, 1954), 73-82.

_____. and Ruth Hill Unseem. The Western-Educated Man in India. New York: Dryden, 1955.

Ursua, Aurora Ricardo. "The Relationship Between Adeptness in the English Language and Social Adjustment of Foreign Graduate Students." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The Catholic University of America, 1969.

Veroff, Joseph. "African Students in the United States." Journal of Social Issues, XIX, 3 (1963), 48-60.

Vold, Robert D., and Pasupati Mukerjee. "Correlation of Indian Training with American School Requirements." Journal of Chemical Education, XLVI (December, 1969), 833-837.

Walker, John, et al. "Rationale for International Students II." College and University, XLV (Summer, 1970), 405-414.

Walton, Barbara J. "Foreign Student Exchange in Perspective: Research of Foreign Students in the United States." Department of State Publication #8373 (April, 1968).

- Warmbrunn, Werner and Catherine Spalter. An Exploration of the Distribution of Academic Failure of Foreign Students at Stanford University, 1952-1956. Stanford: Stanford University, 1957.
- Watson, Jeanne and Ronald Lippitt. Learning Across Cultures: A Study of Germans Visiting America. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, Institute for Social Research, 1955.
- Wenner, Lambert Nathaniel. "The American High School Overseas: The Impact of A Unique Environment Upon A Traditional Institutional System." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Syracuse University, 1970.
- Wheeler, W. Reginald, Henry H. King, Alexander B. Davidson (eds.). The Foreign Student in America. New York: Association Press, 1925.
- Whitten, Woodrow C. "Floating Campus." Improving College and University Teaching, XVII (Autumn, 1969), 283-286.
- Wight, A. Experiential Cross-Cultural Training. Estes Park: Center for Research and Education, 1970.
- Wilcox, Lee. "A Prediction Study of African Students Selected Through the African Scholarship Programs of American Universities." Unpublished Study, Conference on Admission and Guidance of African Students, Howard University (1967).
- _____. et al. "Guidelines for Institutional Followup on International Students." College and University, XLV (Summer, 1970), 439-453.
- Williams, David B. "The Development of Effective Academic Programs for Foreign Students: Curricular, Work Experience, and Social Aspects." Unpublished Study, American Association for the Advancement of Science, Cleveland, Ohio (1963).
- Wilson, Ernest J. "References to African Students in 'A Survey of Attitudes and Interests of Foreign Students at Howard University'." Unpublished Study, Conference on Admission and Guidance of African Students, Howard University (1967).
- Wofford, Kate V. The Workshop Way with Foreign Students: A Report of a Turkish Project in Rural Education at The College of Education, University of Florida. Gainesville: University of Florida Press, 1954.
- Wybourn, Marjory. "Educational Experiences for International Students." Journal of Home Economics, LXIII (December, 1971), 651-655.
- Yebio, B. The Academic Adjustment of A Group of Foreign Students in Sweden. Malmo, Sweden: School of Education, Department of Educational and Psychological Research, 1967.

Yung-Szi Liu. "The Academic Achievement of Chinese Graduate Students at the University of Michigan (1907-1950)." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Michigan, 1955.

Zalinger, Alvin D. The West African Student and American Race Relations. New York: American Society of African Culture, 1959.

Zeigler, A. Lee. "Foreign Student Programs in the United Kingdom." International Educational and Cultural Exchange, V (Summer, 1969), 35-48.

Zojonc, Robert B. "Aggressive Attitudes of the 'Stranger' as a Function of Conformity Pressures." Human Relations, V (1952), 205-216.

U.S. Colleges in Phase I Data

- 01 Kalamazoo College
- 02 Denison University
- 03 Wabash College
- 04 De Pauw University
- 05 Ohio Wesleyan University
- 06 Kent State University
- 07 Earlham College
- 08 Oberlin College
- 09 Otterbein College
- 10 Allegheny College
- 11 Antioch College
- 12 Wooster College
- 13 Wilmington College
- 14 Hobart College
- 15 Hartwick College
- 16 Hope College
- 17 Albion College
- 18 U.C.L.A.
- 19 U.C. Santa Cruz
- 20 U.C. Davis
- 21 U.C. Santa Barbara
- 22 U.C. Berkeley
- 23 U.C. Irvine
- 24 U.C. Riverside
- 25 U.C. San Diego
- 26 Kellogg Community College
- 27 Miami University - Ohio
- 28 University of Maryland
- 29 Black Hawk College
- 30 Findlay College
- 31 University of Pittsburgh
- 32 Fredonia State

Table VII

74

Major-Minors Represented in Phase I Data
Alphabetical

46 Agriculture	50 Pre-Law
61 American Studies	09 Pre-Medicine
12 Anthropology	14 Psychology
47 Architecture	13 Religion (Theology)
20 Art (Art History)	57 Russian
26 Asian Studies	42 Secondary Education
06 Biology	63 Science
24 Black Studies	45 Social Science (Applied S.S., S. Studies)
38 Business Administration	32 Social Work (Social Welfare)
01 Chemistry	19 Sociology
51 Chicano Studies	27 Spanish
17 Chinese	36 Speech
35 Classics	62 Technical Studies
30 Communication and Culture	22 Theater (Theater Arts)
48 Comparative Literature	23 Urban Studies
21 Computer Science	64 Visual Communications
33 Conservation	55 Zoology
60 Dance	
15 Economics	
18 Education	
41 Elementary Education	
07 English	
58 Engineering	
59 Fine Arts	
05 French	
34 Geology	
04 German	
44 Health (Health Science)	
29 History	
28 Home Economics	
25 Human Relations	
56 Indian Culture	
53 Individual Studies	
37 Japanese (Japanese Area Studies)	
49 Latin American Studies	
39 Life Science	
54 Linguistics	
10 Mathematics	
40 Multiple Major	
11 Music	
31 Nursing	
52 Oriental Languages	
02 Philosophy	
43 Physical Education	
08 Physics	
03 Political Science (International Relations)	
16 Pre-Dental	

Location of Overseas Study, Phase I Data

01 Bonn	41 Europe (several countries)*
02 Erlangen	42 Glasgow, Scotland
03 Hannover	43 Passau, Germany
04 Muenster	44 Grenoble, France
05 Julich	45 India
06 Berlin	46 Heidleberg, Germany
07 Aix-en-Provence	47 Yugoslavia
08 Caen	48 Verona
09 Strasburg	49 Durham, England
10 Vichy/Clermont-Ferrand	50 Tübingen, Germany
11 Columbia (Bogota)	51 Santiago, Chile
12 Spain (Madrid)	52 London
13 Sweden	53 Grantham, Lincs, England
14 United Kingdom	54 Basel, Switzerland
15 Nigeria	55 Florence
16 Nairobi, Kenya	56 Wroxton, England
17 Liberia	57 Oxford, England
18 Freetown, Sierra Leone	58 Dijon, France
19 Japan (Tokyo)	59 Segovia, Spain
20 Dakar, Senegal	60 France
21 Aberdeen, Scotland	61 Neuchâtel, Switzerland
22 Beirut, Lebanon	62 South America (several countries)*
23 Iran	
24 Mexico	
25 Göttingen, Germany	
26 Ghana (University of Accra)	
27 Germany	
28 Israel (Jerusalem)	
29 Vienna	
30 Staufien, Germany	
31 Athens	
32 Freiburg, Germany	
33 Copenhagen	
34 Schwäbisch Hall, Germany	
35 St. Andrews, Scotland	
36 Paris	
37 Edinburgh, Scotland	
38 England	
39 Blaubeuren, Germany	
40 Radolfzell, Germany	

*students in this category traveled throughout their study and hence cannot be placed in a single location

Location of Domestic Study, Phase I Data

99 Philadelphia
98 New York City
97 Holland, Michigan
96 Summit, Illinois
95 Williams, Oregon
94 Jackson, Michigan
93 Fort Wayne, Indiana
92 Denver, Colorado
91 Boston, Mass.
90 Dowling, Michigan
89 Groton, Mass.
88 Farmington, Michigan
87 Bethesda, Maryland
86 Waterford, Conn.
85 Ann Arbor, Michigan
84 Albuquerque, New Mexico
83 Rochester, N.Y.
82 Nanjemoy, Maryland
81 Detroit
80 Kalamazoo, Michigan
79 Phoenix, Arizona
78 Washington, D.C.
77 Chicago, Illinois
76 New Castle, Indiana
75 Concord, N.H.
74 Jackson, California
73 Pontiac, Michigan
72 La Plant, South Dakota
71 Greenfield, N.H.
70 Lakeville, Illinois
69 Mount Pleasant, Iowa
68 Kingston, N.Y.
66 Dallas, Texas
66 Miami, Florida
65 Nashville, Michigan
64 Portland, Oregon

Experimental Categories, Phase I

- I. Developing Tolerance
- II. Feelings Directed toward the Home Institution
- III. Social Interaction with those of a Culture Distinct from One's Own
- IV. Experiential Living with and within a Host Family Structure
- V. Experiential Living with a Roommate
- VI. Comparison of Societies Distinct from One's Own
- VII. Observation of Society Distinct from One's Own
- VIII. Instructional Program Distinct from that Available at the Home Institution
- IX. Appreciation of a Culture Distinct from One's Own
- X. Development of the Individual Person
- XI. Language Competency - Comprehension
- XII. Language Fluency
- XIII. Language Use
- XIV. Independent Items

PAGES 78-187 WERE

[REDACTED] MISSING FROM THE DOCUMENT THAT WAS
SUBMITTED TO ERIC DOCUMENT REPRODUCTION SERVICE.

Form A

Analysis of Variance of Categories by
Length of Stay at the Off-Campus Location

	SV	df	SS	MS	F
Developing Tolerance	Between	5	184.79	36.95	2.32*
	Within	372	5918.18	15.91	
Feelings Directed toward the Home Institution	Between	5	271.03	54.20	3.61*
	Within	372	5575.52	14.98	
Social Interaction with those of a Culture Distinct from One's Own	Between	5	1321.96	264.39	15.53*
	Within	372	6329.59	17.01	
Experiencial Living with and within a Host Family Structure	Between	5	10600.43	2120.08	6.75*
	Within	372	116675.25	313.64	
Experiencial Living with a Roommate	Between	5	25.67	5.13	.79
	Within	372	2398.97	6.44	
Comparison of Societies Distinct from One's Own	Between	5	316.18	63.23	1.49
	Within	372	15686.81	42.16	
Observation of Society Distinct from One's Own	Between	5	250.71	50.15	7.02*
	Within	372	2656.34	7.14	
Instructional Program Distinct from that Available at the Home Institution	Between	5	765.37	153.07	9.74*
	Within	372	5846.06	15.71	
Appreciation of a Culture Distinct from One's Own	Between	5	474.06	94.81	9.19*
	Within	372	3834.25	10.30	
Development of the Individual Person	Between	5	1734.43	346.88	3.28*
	Within	372	39308.56	105.66	
Language Competency - Comprehension	Between	5	1219.26	243.85	4.39*
	Within	372	20621.73	55.43	
Language Fluency	Between	5	1648.59	329.71	4.60*
	Within	372	26633.96	71.59	
Language Use	Between	5	571.73	114.34	10.71*
	Within	372	3971.60	10.67	

* p less than .05

Form A

Analysis of Variance of Categories by
Major

	SV	df	SS	MS	F
Developing Tolerance	Between	6	458.27	76.37	5.02*
	Within	371	5644.66	15.21	
Feelings Directed toward the Home Institution	Between	6	304.39	50.73	3.39*
	Within	371	5542.17	14.93	
Social Interaction with those of a Culture Distinct from One's Own	Between	6	498.51	83.08	4.30*
	Within	371	7153.04	19.28	
Experiential Living with and within a Host Family Structure	Between	6	3675.31	612.55	1.83
	Within	371	123600.68	333.15	
Experiential Living with a Roommate	Between	6	100.13	16.68	2.66*
	Within	371	2324.51	6.26	
Comparison of Societies Distinct from One's Own	Between	6	463.64	77.27	1.84
	Within	371	15539.35	41.88	
Observation of Society Distinct from One's Own	Between	6	255.17	42.53	5.94*
	Within	371	2651.96	7.14	
Instructional Program Distinct from that Available at the Home Institution	Between	6	454.91	75.81	4.56*
	Within	371	6156.43	16.59	
Appreciation of a Culture Distinct from One's Own	Between	6	353.73	58.95	5.53*
	Within	371	3954.58	10.65	
Development of the Individual Person	Between	6	1945.58	324.26	3.07*
	Within	371	39097.41	105.38	
Language Competency - Comprehension	Between	6	1509.11	251.51	4.58*
	Within	371	20331.88	54.80	
Language Fluency	Between	6	1306.47	217.74	2.99*
	Within	371	26976.08	72.71	
Language Use	Between	6	481.73	80.28	7.33*
	Within	371	4061.59	10.94	

* p less than .05

Form A

Analysis of Variance of Categories by
Extent of Previous Travel

	SV	df	SS	MS	F
Developing Tolerance	Between	4	30.54	7.63	.46
	Within	373	6072.39	16.27	
Feelings Directed toward the Home Institution	Between	4	27.53	6.88	.44
	Within	373	5813.09	15.60	
Social Interaction with those of a Culture Distinct from One's Own	Between	4	417.83	104.45	5.38*
	Within	373	7233.72	19.39	
Experiential Living with and within a Host Family Structure	Between	4	544.87	136.21	.40
	Within	373	126730.81	339.76	
Experiential Living with a Roommate	Between	4	3.37	.84	.13
	Within	373	2421.27	6.49	
Comparison of Societies Distinct from One's Own	Between	4	246.37	61.59	1.45
	Within	373	15756.62	42.24	
Observation of Society Distinct from One's Own	Between	4	71.47	17.86	2.35
	Within	373	2835.67	7.60	
Instructional Program Distinct from that Available at the Home Institution	Between	4	180.31	45.07	2.61*
	Within	373	6431.12	17.24	
Appreciation of a Culture Distinct from One's Own	Between	4	170.42	42.60	3.84*
	Within	373	4137.88	11.09	
Development of the Individual Person	Between	4	585.75	146.43	1.35
	Within	373	40457.25	108.46	
Language Competency - Comprehension	Between	4	490.78	122.69	2.14
	Within	373	21350.21	57.23	
Language Fluency	Between	4	500.86	125.21	1.68
	Within	373	27781.56	74.48	
Language Use	Between	4	140.17	35.04	2.96*
	Within	373	4403.16	11.80	

* p less than .05

Form A

Analysis of Variance of Categories by
Participation in other Off-Campus Programs

	SV	df	SS	MS	F
Developing Tolerance	Between	2	71.54	35.77	2.22
	Within	375	6031.93	16.08	
Feelings Directed toward the Home Institution	Between	2	8.41	4.20	.27
	Within	375	5838.15	15.56	
Social Interaction with those of a Culture Distinct from One's Own	Between	2	117.44	58.72	2.92
	Within	375	7534.11	20.09	
Experiencial Living with and within a Host Family Structure	Between	2	100.87	50.43	.14
	Within	375	127174.81	339.13	
Experiencial Living with a Roommate	Between	2	9.47	4.73	.73
	Within	375	2415.18	6.44	
Comparison of Societies Distinct from One's Own	Between	2	56.20	28.10	.66
	Within	375	15946.79	42.52	
Observation of Society Distinct from One's Own	Between	2	4.74	2.37	.30
	Within	375	2902.40	7.73	
Instructional Program Distinct from that Available at the Home Institution	Between	2	38.62	19.31	1.10
	Within	375	6579.81	17.52	
Appreciation of a Culture Distinct from One's Own	Between	2	11.52	5.76	.50
	Within	375	4296.78	11.45	
Development of the Individual Person	Between	2	48.95	24.47	.22
	Within	375	40994.04	109.31	
Language Competency - Comprehension	Between	2	46.03	23.01	.39
	Within	375	21794.96	58.11	
Language Fluency	Between	2	148.30	74.15	.98
	Within	375	28134.25	75.02	
Language Use	Between	2	36.95	18.47	1.53
	Within	375	4506.37	12.01	

Form A

Analysis of Variance of Categories by
Previous Residence

	SV	df	SS	MS	F
Developing Tolerance	Between	5	126.88	25.37	1.57
	Within	372	5976.05	16.06	
Feelings Directed toward the Home Institution	Between	5	274.99	54.99	3.67*
	Within	372	5571.57	14.97	
Social Interaction with those of a Culture Distinct from One's Own	Between	5	165.61	33.12	1.64
	Within	372	7485.94	20.12	
Experiential Living with and within a Host Family Structure	Between	5	1148.06	229.61	.67
	Within	372	126127.62	339.05	
Experiential Living with a Roommate	Between	5	69.23	13.84	2.13
	Within	372	2355.42	6.33	
Comparison of Societies Distinct from One's Own	Between	5	173.82	34.76	.81
	Within	372	15829.17	42.55	
Observation of Society Distinct from One's Own	Between	5	36.51	7.30	.94
	Within	372	2870.62	7.71	
Instructional Program Distinct from that Available at the Home Institution	Between	5	100.51	20.10	1.14
	Within	372	6510.91	12.50	
Appreciation of a Culture Distinct from One's Own	Between	5	111.04	22.20	1.96
	Within	372	4197.26	11.28	
Development of the Individual Person	Between	5	1485.31	297.06	2.79*
	Within	372	39557.68	106.33	
Language Competency - Comprehension	Between	5	168.33	33.66	.57
	Within	372	21672.66	58.25	
Language Fluency	Between	5	515.03	103.00	1.38
	Within	372	27767.53	74.64	
Language Use	Between	5	71.51	14.30	1.13
	Within	372	4471.81	12.02	

* p less than .05

Form A

Analysis of Variance of Categories by
Present Correspondence with Off-Campus Location

	SV	df	SS	MS	F
Developing Tolerance	Between	6	172.97	28.82	1.80
	Within	371	5929.96	15.98	
Feelings Directed toward the Home Institution	Between	6	329.23	54.87	3.68*
	Within	371	5517.33	14.87	
Social Interaction with those of a Culture Distinct from One's Own	Between	6	2984.70	497.45	39.54*
	Within	371	4666.85	12.57	
Experiential Living with and within a Host Family Structure	Between	6	3215.31	535.88	1.60
	Within	371	124060.37	334.39	
Experiential Living with a Roommate	Between	6	66.10	11.01	1.73
	Within	371	2358.54	6.35	
Comparison of Societies Distinct from One's Own	Between	6	278.41	46.40	1.09
	Within	371	15724.58	42.38	
Observation of Society Distinct from One's Own	Between	6	238.13	39.68	5.51*
	Within	371	2669.00	7.19	
Instructional Program Distinct from that Available at the Home Institution	Between	6	636.18	106.03	6.58*
	Within	371	5975.25	16.10	
Appreciation of a Culture Distinct from One's Own	Between	6	549.62	91.60	9.04*
	Within	371	3758.69	10.13	
Development of the Individual Person	Between	6	1840.82	306.80	2.90*
	Within	371	39202.17	105.66	
Language Competency - Comprehension	Between	6	469.07	78.16	1.35
	Within	371	21371.92	57.60	
Language Fluency	Between	6	786.97	131.16	1.76
	Within	371	27495.58	74.11	
Language Use	Between	6	562.59	93.76	8.73*
	Within	371	3980.73	10.72	

* p less than .05

Form A

Analysis of Variance of Categories by
Present Reading of Off-Campus Materials

	SV	df	SS	MS	F
Developing Tolerance	Between	6	247.04	41.17	2.60*
	Within	371	5855.89	15.78	
Feelings Directed toward the Home Institution	Between	6	536.63	89.43	6.24*
	Within	371	5309.92	14.31	
Social Interaction with those of a Culture Distinct from One's Own	Between	6	1190.55	198.42	11.39*
	Within	371	6461.00	17.41	
Experiencial Living with and within a Host Family Structure	Between	6	7414.87	1235.81	3.82*
	Within	371	119860.81	323.07	
Experiencial Living with a Roommate	Between	6	19.36	3.22	.49
	Within	371	2405.89	6.48	
Comparison of Societies Distinct from One's Own	Between	6	545.01	90.83	2.18*
	Within	371	15457.93	41.66	
Observation of Society Distinct from One's Own	Between	6	429.50	71.58	10.71*
	Within	371	2477.63	6.67	
Instructional Program Distinct from that Available at the Home Institution	Between	6	1135.54	189.25	12.82*
	Within	371	5475.89	14.75	
Appreciation of a Culture Distinct from One's Own	Between	6	1020.14	170.02	19.18*
	Within	371	3288.16	8.86	
Development of the Individual Person	Between	6	3464.60	577.43	5.70*
	Within	371	37578.39	101.28	
Language Competency - Comprehension	Between	6	1259.47	209.91	3.78*
	Within	371	20581.52	55.47	
Language Fluency	Between	6	2478.15	413.02	5.93*
	Within	371	25804.40	69.55	
Language Use	Between	6	293.51	48.91	4.27*
	Within	371	4249.82	11.45	

* p less than .05

Form A

Analysis of Variance of Categories by
Present Interest in Off-Campus Area

	SV	df	SS	MS	F
Developing Tolerance	Between	6	382.05	63.67	4.12*
	Within	371	5720.88	15.42	
Feelings Directed toward the Home Institution	Between	6	498.65	83.10	5.76*
	Within	371	5347.90	14.41	
Social Interaction with those of a Culture Distinct from One's Own	Between	6	1062.24	117.04	9.96*
	Within	371	6589.31	17.76	
Experiential Living with and within a Host Family Structure	Between	6	3240.50	540.08	1.61
	Within	371	124035.18	334.32	
Experiential Living with a Roommate	Between	6	41.39	6.89	1.07
	Within	371	2383.25	6.42	
Comparison of Societies Distinct from One's Own	Between	6	449.12	74.85	1.78
	Within	371	15553.87	41.92	
Observation of Society Distinct from One's Own	Between	6	499.94	83.32	12.84*
	Within	371	2407.20	6.48	
Instructional Program Distinct from that Available at the Home Institution	Between	6	1142.10	190.35	12.91*
	Within	371	5469.33	14.74	
Appreciation of a Culture Distinct from One's Own	Between	6	1406.04	234.34	29.95*
	Within	371	2902.26	7.82	
Development of the Individual Person	Between	6	4025.50	670.91	6.72*
	Within	371	37017.50	99.77	
Language Competency - Comprehension	Between	6	1433.64	238.94	4.34*
	Within	371	20407.35	55.00	
Language Fluency	Between	6	2438.60	406.43	5.83*
	Within	371	25843.95	69.66	
Language Use	Between	6	346.63	57.77	5.10*
	Within	371	4196.69	11.31	

* p less than .05

Form A

Analysis of Variance of Categories by
Geographic Location

	SV	df	SS	MS	F
Developing Tolerance	Between	6	124.89	20.81	1.29
	Within	371	5978.03	16.11	
Feelings Directed toward the Home Institution	Between	6	152.07	25.34	1.65
	Within	371	5694.49	15.34	
Social Interaction with those of a Culture Distinct from One's Own	Between	6	558.10	93.01	4.86*
	Within	371	7093.45	19.11	
Experiential Living with and within a Host Family Structure	Between	6	data confounded		
	Within	371			
Experiential Living with a Roommate	Between	6	data confounded		
	Within	371			
Comparison of Societies Distinct from One's Own	Between	6	274.10	45.68	1.077
	Within	371	15728.89	42.39	
Observation of Society Distinct from One's Own	Between	6	data confounded		
	Within	371			
Instructional Program Distinct from that Available at the Home Institution	Between	6	611.56	101.92	6.30*
	Within	371	5999.87	16.17	
Appreciation of a Culture Distinct from One's Own	Between	6	data confounded		
	Within	371			
Development of the Individual Person	Between	6	735.25	122.54	1.12
	Within	371	40307.74	108.64	
Language Competency - Comprehension	Between	6	data confounded		
	Within	371			
Language Fluency	Between	6	1625.89	270.98	3.77*
	Within	371	26656.67	71.85	
Language Use	Between	6	309.51	51.58	4.52*
	Within	371	4233.81	11.41	

* p less than .05

Form A

Analysis of Variance of Categories by
Presence of Host Family

	SV	df	SS	MS	F
Developing Tolerance	Between	7	269.14	38.44	2.43
	Within	370	5833.78	15.76	
Feelings Directed toward the Home Institution	Between	7	231.09	33.01	2.17
	Within	370	5615.46	15.17	
Social Interaction with those of a Culture Distinct from One's Own	Between	7	588.79	84.11	4.40*
	Within	370	7062.76	19.08	
Experiential Living with a Roommate	Between	7	59.58	8.51	1.33
	Within	370	2365.06	6.39	
Comparison of Societies Distinct from One's Own	Between	7	538.96	76.99	1.84
	Within	370	15464.03	41.79	
Observation of Society Distinct from One's Own	Between	7	196.41	28.05	3.82*
	Within	370	2710.73	7.32	
Instructional Program Distinct from that Available at the Home Institution	Between	7	300.13	42.87	2.51
	Within	370	6311.30	17.05	
Appreciation of a Culture Distinct from One's Own	Between	7	372.70	53.24	5.00*
	Within	370	3935.60	10.63	
Development of the Individual Person	Between	7	1361.74	194.53	1.81
	Within	370	39681.25	107.24	
Language Competency - Comprehension	Between	7	3429.37	489.91	9.84*
	Within	370	18411.62	49.76	
Language Fluency	Between	7	4236.71	605.24	9.31*
	Within	370	24045.84	64.98	
Language Use	Between	7	265.04	37.86	3.27
	Within	370	4278.29	11.56	

* p less than .05

Form A

Analysis of Variance of Categories by
Presence of Roommate

	SV	df	SS	MS	F
Developing Tolerance	Between	5	249.19	49.83	3.16
	Within	372	5853.74	15.73	
Feelings Directed toward the Home Institution	Between	5	114.09	22.81	1.48
	Within	372	5732.46	15.40	
Social Interaction with those of a Culture Distinct from One's Own	Between	5	133.23	26.64	1.31
	Within	372	7518.33	20.21	
Comparison of Societies Distinct from One's Own	Between	5	565.27	113.05	2.72
	Within	372	15437.72	41.49	
Observation of Society Distinct from One's Own	Between	5	87.85	17.57	2.31
	Within	372	2819.24	7.57	
Instructional Program Distinct from that Available at the Home Institution	Between	5	218.28	43.65	2.54
	Within	372	6393.15	17.18	
Appreciation of a Culture Distinct from One's Own	Between	5	177.40	35.48	3.19
	Within	372	1130.91	11.10	
Development of the Individual Person	Between	5	1770.12	354.02	3.35
	Within	372	39272.87	105.57	
Language Competency - Comprehension	Between	5	1199.13	239.82	4.32
	Within	372	20541.86	55.48	
Language Fluency	Between	5	1199.91	239.98	3.29
	Within	372	27082.64	72.80	
Language Use	Between	5	222.68	44.53	3.83
	Within	372	4320.65	11.61	

Form A

Analysis of Variance of Categories by
Association with Different Religion

	SV	df	SS	MS	F
Developing Tolerance	Between	5	230.29	46.05	2.91
	Within	372	5872.64	15.78	
Feelings Directed toward the Home Institution	Between	5	70.37	14.07	.90
	Within	372	5776.18	15.52	
Social Interaction with those of a Culture Distinct from One's Own	Between	5	181.24	36.24	1.80
	Within	372	7470.31	20.08	
Experiential Living with and within a Host Family Structure	Between	5	data confounded		
	Within	372			
Experiential Living with a Roommate	Between	5	data confounded		
	Within	372			
Comparison of Societies Distinct from One's Own	Between	5	346.33	69.26	1.64
	Within	372	15656.66	42.08	
Observation of Society Distinct from One's Own	Between	5	data confounded		
	Within	372			
Instructional Program Distinct from that Available at the Home Institution	Between	5	124.70	24.94	1.43
	Within	372	6486.73	17.43	
Appreciation of a Culture Distinct from One's Own	Between	5	data confounded		
	Within	372			
Development of the Individual Person	Between	5	771.14	154.22	1.42
	Within	372	40271.85	108.25	
Language Competency - Comprehension	Between	5	3200.61	640.12	12.77
	Within	372	18640.38	50.10	
Language Fluency	Between	5	4516.75	875.35	13.62
	Within	372	23905.80	64.26	
Language Use	Between	5	167.20	33.44	2.84
	Within	372	4376.13	11.76	

Form B

Analysis of Variance of Categories by
Length of Stay at Off-Campus Location

	SV	df	SS	MS	F
Developing Tolerance	Between	3	32.79	10.93	.59
	Within	106	1953.58	18.43	
Feelings Directed toward the Home Institution	Between	3	109.32	36.44	2.05
	Within	106	1883.95	17.77	
Experiencial Living with a Roommate	Between	3	36.12	12.04	1.78
	Within	106	716.09	6.75	
Comparison of Societies Distinct from One's Own	Between	3	303.78	101.26	1.79
	Within	106	5987.21	56.48	
Observation of Society Distinct from One's Own	Between	3	65.52	21.84	1.91
	Within	106	1211.82	11.43	
Instructional Program Distinct from that Available at the Home Institution	Between	3	32.02	10.67	.39
	Within	106	2870.22	27.07	
Appreciation of a Culture Distinct from One's Own	Between	3	15.01	5.00	.66
	Within	106	802.08	7.56	
Development of the Individual Person	Between	3	611.75	203.91	1.88
	Within	106	11475.06	108.25	

Form B

Analysis of Variance of Categories by
Major Area

	SV	df	SS	MS	F
Developing Tolerance	Between	7	155.91	22.27	1.24
	Within	102	1830.46	17.94	
Feelings Directed toward the Home Institution	Between	7	275.63	39.37	2.33*
	Within	102	1717.64	16.83	
Experiential Living with a Roommate	Between	7	57.56	8.22	1.20
	Within	102	694.65	6.81	
Comparison of Societies Distinct from One's Own	Between	7	282.58	40.37	.68
	Within	102	6008.41	58.90	
Observation of Society Distinct from One's Own	Between	7	72.13	10.30	.87
	Within	102	1205.21	11.81	
Instructional Program Distinct from that Available at the Home Institution	Between	7	72.97	10.42	.37
	Within	102	2829.27	27.73	
Appreciation of a Culture Distinct from One's Own	Between	7	66.69	9.52	1.29
	Within	102	750.40	7.35	
Development of the Individual Person	Between	7	725.33	103.62	.93
	Within	102	11361.47	111.38	

* p less than .05

Form B

Analysis of Variance of Categories by
Extent of Previous Travel

	SV	df	SS	MS	F
Developing Tolerance	Between	3	42.07	14.02	.76
	Within	106	1944.30	18.34	
Feelings Directed toward the Home Institution	Between	3	10.38	3.46	.18
	Within	106	1982.89	18.70	
Experiential Living with a Roommate	Between	3	17.67	5.89	.85
	Within	106	734.53	6.92	
Comparison of Societies Distinct from One's Own	Between	3	6.89	2.29	.03
	Within	106	6284.10	59.28	
Observation of Society Distinct from One's Own	Between	3	47.54	15.84	1.36
	Within	106	1229.81	11.60	
Instructional Program Distinct from that Available at the Home Institution	Between	3	51.22	17.07	.63
	Within	106	2851.02	26.89	
Appreciation of a Culture Distinct from One's Own	Between	3	48.42	16.14	2.22
	Within	106	768.67	7.25	
Development of the Individual Person	Between	3	74.87	24.95	.22
	Within	106	12011.93	113.32	

Form B

Analysis of Variance of Categories by
Participation in other Off-Campus Programs

	SV	df	SS	MS	F
Developing Tolerance	Between	2	41.52	20.76	1.14
	Within	107	1944.85	18.17	
Feelings Directed toward the Home Institution	Between	2	81.00	40.50	2.26
	Within	107	1912.26	17.87	
Experiencial Living with a Roommate	Between	2	3.56	1.78	.25
	Within	107	748.65	6.99	
Comparison of Societies Distinct from One's Own	Between	2	116.85	58.42	1.01
	Within	107	6174.14	57.70	
Observation of Society Distinct from One's Own	Between	2	8.45	4.22	.35
	Within	107	1268.90	11.85	
Instructional Program Distinct from that Available at the Home Institution	Between	2	15.10	7.55	.27
	Within	107	2887.14	26.98	
Appreciation of a Culture Distinct from One's Own	Between	2	18.51	9.25	1.24
	Within	107	798.58	7.46	
Development of the Individual Person	Between	2	9.03	4.51	.04
	Within	107	12077.77	112.87	

Form B

Analysis of Variance of Categories by
Previous Residence

	SV	df	SS	MS	F
Developing Tolerance	Between	4	242.15	60.53	3.64*
	Within	105	1744.22	16.61	
Feelings Directed toward the Home Institution	Between	4	211.85	52.96	3.12*
	Within	105	1781.41	16.96	
Experiential Living with a Roommate	Between	4	20.03	5.00	.71
	Within	105	732.18	6.97	
Comparison of Societies Distinct from One's Own	Between	4	329.19	82.29	1.44
	Within	105	5961.80	56.77	
Observation of Society Distinct from One's Own	Between	4	62.55	15.63	1.35
	Within	105	1214.79	11.56	
Instructional Program Distinct from that Available at the Home Institution	Between	4	158.76	39.69	1.51
	Within	105	2743.48	26.12	
Appreciation of a Culture Distinct from One's Own	Between	4	82.12	20.53	2.93*
	Within	105	734.98	6.99	
Development of the Individual Person	Between	4	504.06	126.01	1.14
	Within	105	11582.74	110.31	

* p less than .05

Form B

Analysis of Variance of Categories by
Present Correspondence with Off-Campus Location

	SV	df	SS	MS	F
Developing Tolerance	Between	6	144.65	24.10	1.34
	Within	103	1841.73	17.88	
Feelings Directed toward the Home Institution	Between	6	43.74	7.29	.38
	Within	103	1949.53	18.92	
Experiencial Living with a Roommate	Between	6	22.14	3.69	.52
	Within	103	730.07	7.08	
Comparison of Societies Distinct from One's Own	Between	6	656.54	109.42	2.00
	Within	103	5634.45	54.70	
Observation of Society Distinct from One's Own	Between	6	44.64	7.44	.62
	Within	103	1232.70	11.96	
Instructional Program Distinct from that Available at the Home Institution	Between	6	120.73	20.12	.74
	Within	103	2781.51	27.00	
Appreciation of a Culture Distinct from One's Own	Between	6	38.58	6.48	.85
	Within	103	778.22	7.55	
Development of the Individual Person	Between	6	559.21	93.20	.83
	Within	103	11527.59	111.91	

Form B

Analysis of Variance of Categories by
Present Reading of Off-Campus Materials

	SV	df	SS	MS	F
Developing Tolerance	Between	5	55.60	11.12	.59
	Within	104	1930.77	18.56	
Feelings Directed toward the Home Institution	Between	5	139.47	27.89	1.56
	Within	104	1853.80	17.82	
Comparison of Societies Distinct from One's Own	Between	5	91.90	18.38	.30
	Within	104	6199.07	59.60	
Observation of Society Distinct from One's Own	Between	5	91.99	18.39	1.61
	Within	104	1185.35	11.39	
Instructional Program Distinct from that Available at the Home Institution	Between	5	124.18	24.83	.92
	Within	104	2778.06	26.71	
Appreciation of a Culture Distinct from One's Own	Between	5	70.04	14.00	1.95
	Within	104	747.05	7.18	
Development of the Individual Person	Between	5	506.58	101.31	.90
	Within	104	11580.22	111.34	

Form C

Analysis of Variance of Categories by
Major

	SV	df	SS	MS	F
Developing Tolerance	Between	6	83.72	13.95	1.03
	Within	228	3059.89	13.42	
Feelings Directed toward the Home Institution	Between	6	34.19	5.69	.36
	Within	228	3532.99	15.49	
Social Interaction with those of a Culture Distinct from One's Own	Between	6	232.48	38.74	3.01*
	Within	228	2934.95	12.87	
Experiencial Living with a Roommate	Between	6	504.46	84.07	168.54*
	Within	228	113.73	.49	
Comparison of Societies Distinct from One's Own	Between	6	338.46	56.41	1.50*
	Within	228	8555.91	37.52	
Observation of Society Distinct from One's Own	Between	6	109.96	18.32	3.34*
	Within	228	1249.67	5.48	
Instructional Program Distinct from that Available at the Home Institution	Between	6	59.68	9.94	.74
	Within	228	3051.43	13.38	
Appreciation of a Culture Distinct from One's Own	Between	6	3.36	.56	.15
	Within	228	833.25	3.65	
Development of the Individual Person	Between	6	1237.76	206.29	2.62*
	Within	228	17892.73	78.47	

* p less than .05

Form C

Analysis of Variance of Categories by
Extent of Previous Travel

	SV	df	SS	MS	F
Developing Tolerance	Between	2	5.62	2.81	.20
	Within	232	3138.00	13.52	
Feelings Directed toward the Home Institution	Between	2	60.62	30.31	2.00
	Within	232	3506.55	15.11	
Social Interaction with those of a Culture Distinct from One's Own	Between	2	23.65	11.82	.87
	Within	232	3143.78	13.55	
Experiencial Living with a Roommate	Between	2	35.06	17.53	6.97*
	Within	232	583.13	2.51	
Comparison of Societies Distinct from One's Own	Between	2	10.00	5.00	.13
	Within	232	8884.37	38.29	
Observation of Society Distinct from One's Own	Between	2	17.83	8.91	1.54
	Within	232	1341.81	5.78	
Instructional Program Distinct from that Available at the Home Institution	Between	2	82.64	41.32	3.16*
	Within	232	3028.48	13.05	
Appreciation of a Culture Distinct from One's Own	Between	2	5.28	2.64	.73
	Within	232	831.34	3.58	
Development of the Individual Person	Between	2	662.68	331.34	4.16*
	Within	232	18467.81	79.60	

* p less than .05

Form C

Analysis of Variance of Categories by
Participation in other Off-Campus Programs

	SV	df	SS	MS	F
Developing Tolerance	Between	2	19.29	9.64	.71
	Within	232	3124.33	13.46	
Feelings Directed toward the Home Institution	Between	2	139.51	69.75	4.72*
	Within	232	3427.67	14.77	
Social Interaction with those of a Culture Distinct from One's Own	Between	2	6.79	3.39	.24
	Within	232	3160.64	13.62	
Experiencial Living with a Roommate	Between	2	12.87	6.43	2.46
	Within	232	605.32	2.60	
Comparison of Societies Distinct from One's Own	Between	2	187.39	93.69	2.49
	Within	232	8706.98	37.53	
Observation of Society Distinct from One's Own	Between	2	87.03	43.51	7.93*
	Within	232	1272.61	5.48	
Instructional Program Distinct from that Available at the Home Institution	Between	2	207.39	103.69	8.28*
	Within	232	2903.72	12.51	
Appreciation of a Culture Distinct from One's Own	Between	2	.45	.22	.06
	Within	232	836.17	3.60	
Development of the Individual Person	Between	2	719.31	359.65	4.53*
	Within	232	18411.18	79.35	

* p less than .05

Form C

Analysis of Variance of Categories by
Previous Residence

	SV	df	SS	MS	F
Developing Tolerance	Between	3	57.41	19.13	1.43
	Within	231	3086.21	13.36	
Feelings Directed toward the Home Institution	Between	3	92.67	30.89	2.05
	Within	231	3474.50	15.04	
Social Interaction with those of a Culture Distinct from One's Own	Between	3	71.81	23.93	1.78
	Within	231	3095.62	13.40	
Experiencial Living with a Roommate	Between	3	1.82	.60	.22
	Within	231	616.37	2.66	
Comparison of Societies Distinct from One's Own	Between	3	121.57	40.52	1.06
	Within	231	8772.80	37.97	
Observation of Society Distinct from One's Own	Between	3	15.16	5.05	.86
	Within	231	1344.48	5.82	
Instructional Program Distinct from that Available at the Home Institution	Between	3	415.59	138.53	11.87*
	Within	231	2695.52	11.66	
Appreciation of a Culture Distinct from One's Own	Between	3	5.09	1.69	.47
	Within	231	831.52	3.59	
Development of the Individual Person	Between	3	103.00	34.33	.51
	Within	231	19027.50	82.37	

* p less than .05

Form C

Analysis of Variance of Categories by
Present Reading of Off-Campus Materials

	SV	df	SS	MS	F
Developing Tolerance	Between	4	158.63	39.65	3.05*
	Within	230	2984.98	12.97	
Feelings Directed toward the Home Institution	Between	4	100.16	25.04	1.66
	Within	230	3467.02	15.07	
Social Interaction with those of a Culture Distinct from One's Own	Between	4	499.62	124.90	10.76*
	Within	230	2667.81	11.59	
Experiential Living with a Roommate	Between	4	8.02	2.00	.75
	Within	230	610.17	2.65	
Comparison of Societies Distinct from One's Own	Between	4	265.31	66.32	1.76
	Within	230	8629.06	37.51	
Observation of Society Distinct from One's Own	Between	4	290.16	72.54	15.60*
	Within	230	1069.47	4.64	
Instructional Program Distinct from that Available at the Home Institution	Between	4	112.02	28.00	2.14
	Within	230	2999.10	13.03	
Appreciation of a Culture Distinct from One's Own	Between	4	18.70	4.67	1.31
	Within	230	817.92	3.55	
Development of the Individual Person	Between	4	1480.95	370.23	4.82*
	Within	230	17649.54	76.73	

* p less than .05

Average Category Responses on 1-5 Scale*

Category	Form A		Form B		Form C	
	mean	variance	mean	variance	mean	variance
Developing Tolerance	2.29	.33	3.43	.73	2.42	.27
Feelings Directed toward the Home Institution	2.55	.24	2.68	.29	2.86	.24
Social Interaction with those of a Culture Distinct from One's Own	3.68	.25	2.63	.40	3.10	.21
Experiential Living with and within a Host Family Structure	1.64					
Experiential Living with a Roommate	1.78	.71	1.04	.77	1.97	.29
Comparison of Societies Distinct from One's Own	2.66	.09	2.69	.15	2.78	.10
Observation of Society Distinct from One's Own	2.17	.21	2.62	.33	2.57	.23
Instructional Program Distinct from that Available at the Home Institution	2.90	.22	2.80	.42	2.61	.21
Appreciation of a Culture Distinct from One's Own	2.42	.32	2.43	.47	2.73	.12
Development of the Individual Person	2.44	.22	2.46	.25	2.69	.19

*differences of .2 are statistically significant (.05)

Form A

Means by Previous Travel

- c. omitted
 a. less than 500 miles
 b. quite extensive, but not outside of the United States or Canada
 c. to one or more foreign countries
 d. to one or more foreign countries, including a country that was a focal point of your off-campus study

	o	a	b	c	d
Developing Tolerance	13.00	15.50	16.13	15.80	16.26
Feelings Directed toward the Home Institution	22.00	19.78	20.58	20.13	20.49
Social Interaction with those of a Culture Distinct from One's Own	23.00	23.71	25.41	23.62	22.90
Experiential Living with and within a Host Family Structure	0.0	19.59	18.32	18.46	16.99
Experiential Living with a Roommate	3.00	2.40	2.34	2.43	2.20
Comparison of Societies Distinct from One's Own	58.00	57.37	59.27	57.61	59.16
Observation of Society Distinct from One's Own	9.00	12.75	13.54	12.66	12.89
Instructional Program Distinct from that Available at the Home Institution	33.00	25.06	26.76	25.88	25.53
Appreciation of a Culture Distinct from One's Own	17.00	14.56	15.26	14.38	13.60
Development of the Individual Person	62.00	50.68	54.40	52.69	54.43
Language Competency - Comprehension	17.00	19.18	20.30	17.47	18.73
Language Fluency	22.00	22.59	22.38	20.35	19.92
Language Use	10.00	10.81	12.01	12.00	10.72

Form A

Means by Major

- a. humanities (English, philosophy, etc.)
 b. fine arts (music, art, drama, etc.)
 c. natural sciences (chemistry, biology, math, etc.)
 d. social sciences (sociology, anthropology, political science, history, etc.)
 e. language(s)
 f. other: please explain _____
 g. multiple response

	a	b	c	d	e	f	g
Developing Tolerance	16.40	15.75	18.59	15.26	15.68	14.86	15.97
Feelings Directed toward the Home Institution	20.64	19.50	22.42	19.81	20.47	19.40	20.02
Social Interaction with those of a Culture Distinct from One's Own	24.28	24.57	26.62	23.91	23.02	22.26	23.29
Experiential Living with and within a Host Family Structure	21.53	16.57	18.98	16.05	22.68	11.53	14.75
Experiential Living with a Roommate	2.53	3.39	1.57	2.67	1.79	2.40	2.11
Comparison of Societies Distinct from One's Own	59.00	58.32	61.26	53.00	57.92	58.13	58.50
Observation of Society Distinct from One's Own	12.51	12.82	15.01	12.96	12.58	11.93	12.70
Instructional Program Distinct from that Available at the Home Institution	25.97	26.18	28.71	25.57	25.50	24.06	25.67
Appreciation of a Culture Distinct from One's Own	14.75	14.60	16.73	14.30	13.84	12.93	13.73
Development of the Individual Person	53.24	52.25	58.98	52.37	53.15	50.60	54.58
Language Competency - Comprehension	16.51	18.57	23.36	18.74	18.98	15.13	18.79
Language Fluency	18.46	21.35	24.55	21.40	21.34	16.33	20.41
Language Use	12.46	12.82	12.63	11.88	9.65	11.86	10.08

Form A

Means by Length of Stay

	a.	b.	c.	d.	e.	f.
	15.54	16.97	16.48	15.23	16.04	14.50
Developing Tolerance	20.45	21.26	21.06	19.38	20.00	17.00
Feelings Directed toward the Home Institution	24.66	26.48	25.28	22.06	21.87	19.50
Social Interaction with those of a Culture Distinct from One's Own	26.57	22.52	19.22	15.20	3.37	7.00
Experiential Living with and within a Host Family Structure	2.90	2.60	2.10	2.22	2.45	1.50
Experiential Living with a Roommate	57.69	60.06	59.03	57.77	58.33	56.50
Comparison of Societies Distinct from One's Own	12.84	14.26	13.26	12.12	13.29	15.50
Observation of Society Distinct from One's Own	25.60	27.09	27.61	24.29	26.25	26.00
Instructional Program Distinct from that Available at the Home Institution	14.18	15.05	15.94	13.49	12.87	11.00
Appreciation of a Culture Distinct from One's Own	52.12	56.48	54.88	51.58	53.41	41.50
Development of the Individual Person	20.30	20.84	19.88	17.11	18.87	6.00
Language Competency - Comprehension	22.21	23.26	22.38	18.96	21.12	6.00
Language Fluency	13.15	12.94	12.08	10.24	9.75	11.00
Language Use						

- a. 10 weeks or less
 b. 11 to 16 weeks ($\frac{4}{5}$ months)
 c. 17 to 26 weeks ($\frac{1}{2}$ year)
 d. 27 to 52 weeks (1 year)
 e. more than one year
 f. multiple response

Form A

Means by Other Off-Campus Program

o. omitted

a. no

b. yes, please give date(s) and location(s) _____

	o	a	b
Developing Tolerance	20.66	16.05	15.76
Feelings Directed toward the Home Institution	20.00	20.46	20.13
Social Interaction with those of a Culture Distinct from One's Own	23.66	24.43	23.16
Experiential Living with and within a Host Family Structure	23.66	17.94	18.22
Experiential Living with a Roommate	2.33	2.43	2.07
Comparison of Societies Distinct from One's Own	62.33	58.71	58.27
Observation of Society Distinct from One's Own	12.33	13.10	12.89
Instructional Program Distinct from that Available at the Home Institution	24.00	26.23	25.64
Appreciation of a Culture Distinct from One's Own	12.66	14.57	14.44
Development of the Individual Person	55.33	53.83	53.09
Language Competency - Comprehension	22.33	19.09	18.67
Language Fluency	20.66	21.56	20.13
Language Use	11.33	11.74	11.03

Form A

Means by Previous Residence

- c. omitted
- a. I had lived only in a small town or rural area
- b. I had lived in a suburban area
- c. I had lived in a large city
- d. I had lived in the city of my off-campus experience
- e. multiple response

	o	a	b	c	d	e
Developing Tolerance	20.00	15.25	15.93	16.36	15.00	16.82
Feelings Directed toward the Home Institution	25.66	19.75	20.16	20.41	17.80	22.02
Social Interaction with those of a Culture Distinct from One's Own	21.66	24.29	24.25	22.82	23.00	25.04
Experiential Living with and within a Host Family Structure	22.66	21.69	17.38	17.10	13.40	17.58
Experiential Living with a Roommate	0.0	1.69	2.56	2.46	3.80	2.62
Comparison of Societies Distinct from One's Own	62.00	58.96	58.44	57.74	58.20	59.93
Observation of Society Distinct from One's Own	13.00	12.91	12.99	13.13	11.00	13.58
Instructional Program Distinct from that Available at the Home Institution	25.00	25.50	26.05	25.94	24.60	27.26
Appreciation of a Culture Distinct from One's Own	15.33	14.00	14.59	13.94	13.40	15.71
Development of the Individual Person	59.00	51.64	53.24	53.22	52.00	58.52
Language Competency - Comprehension	21.00	18.38	19.27	17.84	20.00	19.87
Language Fluency	24.66	19.87	21.87	19.32	19.00	22.23
Language Use	9.33	11.06	11.84	11.25	9.60	11.67

Form A

Means by Present Correspondence

- o. omitted
 a. often with many
 b. often with some
 c. now and then with some
 d. seldom except for a few
 e. hardly ever or never
 f. multiple response

	o	a	b	c	d	e	f
Developing Tolerance	15.42	14.96	15.62	16.18	15.30	16.98	18.00
Feelings Directed toward the Home Institution	21.14	19.92	19.03	20.63	20.42	21.53	18.00
Social Interaction with those of a Culture Distinct from One's Own	22.85	20.12	20.95	23.84	25.27	27.95	25.00
Experiential Living with and within a Host Family Structure	27.42	9.60	16.95	18.93	20.08	18.81	0.0
Experiential Living with a Roommate	2.14	2.36	1.91	2.73	1.98	2.57	7.00
Comparison of Societies Distinct from One's Own	57.42	56.96	58.50	58.21	58.15	59.92	60.00
Observation of Society Distinct from One's Own	12.85	11.44	12.80	12.55	12.89	14.22	16.00
Instructional Program Distinct from that Available at the Home Institution	26.00	23.60	25.09	25.68	26.05	28.03	26.00
Appreciation of a Culture Distinct from One's Own	14.85	12.04	13.33	14.60	14.71	16.13	15.00
Development of the Individual Person	51.57	49.96	52.76	52.88	52.39	57.15	47.00
Language Competency - Comprehension	20.57	15.96	18.35	18.64	20.11	19.98	20.00
Language Fluency	23.28	17.36	20.31	20.68	22.67	22.37	26.00
Language Use	11.85	9.68	10.14	11.43	12.18	13.16	11.00

Form A

Means by Present Reading Level

- o. omitted
 a. very strong
 b. strong
 c. mild
 d. very mild
 e. none
 f. multiple response

	o	a	b	c	d	e	f
Developing Tolerance	14.00	14.79	15.62	16.21	16.98	17.84	15.00
Feelings Directed toward the Home Institution	18.60	19.10	19.65	20.31	21.94	23.63	20.00
Social Interaction with those of a Culture Distinct from One's Own	23.00	21.60	22.97	24.44	26.30	28.47	26.00
Experiential Living with and within a Host Family Structure	17.40	11.85	15.30	20.91	20.27	30.73	0.0
Experiential Living with a Roommate	3.20	2.31	2.37	2.46	2.12	1.89	5.00
Comparison of Societies Distinct from One's Own	54.80	57.04	57.81	59.52	60.04	59.63	54.00
Observation of Society Distinct from One's Own	13.80	11.93	12.04	13.62	14.22	15.31	11.00
Instructional Program Distinct from that Available at the Home Institution	23.20	23.06	25.18	26.66	28.51	28.36	26.00
Appreciation of a Culture Distinct from One's Own	13.00	11.79	13.68	14.89	16.84	17.36	11.00
Development of the Individual Person	50.40	48.77	51.71	55.08	57.45	58.89	49.00
Language Competency - Comprehension	19.60	16.83	17.28	20.49	20.64	22.05	26.00
Language Fluency	22.00	18.45	18.76	22.97	23.54	25.63	37.00
Language Use	11.80	10.18	11.27	11.29	12.95	12.94	15.00

Form A

Means by Present Interest

- o. omitted
a. very strong
b. strong
c. mild
d. very mild
e. none
f. multiple response

	c	a	b	c	d	e	f
Developing Tolerance	20.00	15.11	16.31	16.98	20.00	23.00	15.50
Feelings Directed toward the Home Institution	19.00	19.31	20.51	22.58	22.62	25.00	21.00
Social Interaction with those of a Culture Distinct from One's Own	21.00	22.50	24.40	27.35	26.37	25.00	28.50
Experiential Living with and within a Host Family Structure	42.00	16.07	17.91	23.64	21.25	0.0	18.50
Experiential Living with a Roommate	6.00	2.43	2.33	1.86	2.75	6.00	2.50
Comparison of Societies Distinct from One's Own	65.00	57.46	59.28	59.66	59.87	66.00	57.00
Observation of Society Distinct from One's Own	13.00	11.92	13.34	14.77	16.87	17.00	13.00
Instructional Program Distinct from that Available at the Home Institution	23.00	24.23	26.68	29.05	29.00	26.00	23.50
Appreciation of a Culture Distinct from One's Own	11.00	12.60	15.01	17.98	18.25	21.00	15.00
Development of the Individual Person	63.00	50.01	55.30	57.96	59.50	68.00	53.00
Language Competency - Comprehension	21.00	17.38	19.20	22.56	23.37	6.00	22.50
Language Fluency	27.00	19.25	21.12	25.94	27.50	6.00	27.50
Language Use	13.00	10.95	11.32	13.58	14.00	15.00	10.50

Form B

Means by Previous Travel

o. omitted a. less than 500 miles b. quite extensive, but not outside of the United State or Canada c. to one or more foreign countries				
Developing Tolerance	19.00	18.58	16.69	17.35
Feelings Directed toward the Home Institution	23.00	21.83	21.19	21.69
Experiential Living with a Roommate	0.0	3.91	3.06	3.05
Comparison of Societies Distinct from One's Own	52.00	51.66	50.89	51.00
Observation of Society Distinct from One's Own	12.00	15.33	15.36	16.51
Instructional Program Distinct from that Available at the Home Institution	20.00	25.50	24.82	25.82
Appreciation of a Culture Distinct from One's Own	5.00	9.66	9.32	10.38
Development of the Individual Person	50.00	53.00	52.15	50.69

Form B

Means by Major

- o. omitted
- a. humanities (English, philosophy, etc.)
- b. fine arts (music, art, drama, etc.)
- c. natural sciences (chemistry, biology, math, etc.)
- d. social sciences (sociology, anthropology, political science, history, etc.)
- e. language(s)
- f. other: please explain _____
- g. multiple response

	o	a	b	c	d	e	f	g
Developing Tolerance	15.00	17.90	13.66	18.56	17.14	16.33	15.00	16.42
Feelings Directed toward the Home Institution	19.00	21.80	17.16	23.48	21.54	20.66	18.33	20.14
Experiential Living with a Roommate	6.00	2.80	3.33	2.52	3.52	0.0	3.00	3.50
Comparison of Societies Distinct from One's Own	52.00	52.00	49.50	53.64	49.97	51.00	52.33	49.57
Observation of Society Distinct from One's Own	17.00	15.00	16.00	16.80	15.16	18.33	15.33	15.64
Instructional Program Distinct from that Available at the Home Institution	26.00	25.40	23.50	25.68	24.91	27.66	22.66	25.92
Appreciation of a Culture Distinct from One's Own	11.00	10.50	8.66	10.84	9.16	10.33	8.66	9.35
Development of the Individual Person	52.00	51.20	49.16	55.32	51.95	49.66	48.00	47.07

Form B

Means by Length of Stay

- a. 10 weeks or less
 b. 11 to 16 weeks (4 months)
 c. 17 to 26 weeks ($\frac{1}{2}$ year)
 d. 27 to 52 weeks (1 year)
 e. more than one year

	a	b	c	d	e
Developing Tolerance	17.18	17.27	15.16	20.00	no entry
Feelings Directed toward the Home Institution	21.48	21.75	19.16	13.00	no entry
Experiential Living with a Roommate	2.57	3.30	3.33	8.00	no entry
Comparison of Societies Distinct from One's Own	50.27	51.94	45.83	43.00	no entry
Observation of Society Distinct from One's Own	15.72	15.97	12.66	18.00	no entry
Instructional Program Distinct from that Available at the Home Institution	25.54	25.20	23.16	27.00	no entry
Appreciation of a Culture Distinct from One's Own	9.81	9.77	8.16	10.00	no entry
Development of the Individual Person	51.78	52.51	42.00	51.00	no entry

Form B

Means by Other Off-Campus Program

c. omitted

a. no

b. yes, please give date(s) and location(s)

	c	a	b
Developing Tolerance	19.00	16.82	18.25
Feelings Directed toward the Home Institution	16.00	21.14	22.71
Experiential Living with a Roommate	5.00	3.11	3.08
Comparison of Societies Distinct from One's Own	61.00	50.72	51.66
Observation of Society Distinct from One's Own	15.00	15.60	16.25
Instructional Program Distinct from that Available at the Home Institution	28.00	25.04	25.66
Appreciation of a Culture Distinct from One's Own	12.00	9.49	10.33
Development of the Individual Person	49.00	51.67	51.95

Form B

Means by Previous Residence

- a. I had lived only in a small town or rural area
 b. I had lived in a suburban area
 c. I had lived in a large city
 d. I had lived in the city of my off-campus experience
 e. multiple response

	a	b	c	d	e
Developing Tolerance	17.29	16.80	14.78	21.50	19.46
Feelings Directed toward the Home Institution	22.17	21.20	18.71	22.75	23.86
Experiencial Living with a Roommate	3.58	3.25	2.35	4.00	2.60
Comparison of Societies Distinct from One's Own	51.35	49.91	50.78	57.00	53.73
Observation of Society Distinct from One's Own	15.11	15.73	14.64	16.25	17.33
Instructional Program Distinct from that Available at the Home Institution	24.52	25.15	23.28	28.50	27.13
Appreciation of a Culture Distinct from One's Own	8.70	9.80	8.50	10.25	11.00
Development of the Individual Person	49.76	51.23	50.00	56.00	56.26

Form B

Means by Present Correspondence

- o. omitted
- a. often with many
- b. often with some
- c. now and then with some
- d. seldom except for a few
- e. hardly ever or never
- f. multiple response

	o	a	b	c	d	e	f
Developing Tolerance	15.70	18.28	17.91	15.60	17.81	17.00	21.50
Feelings Directed toward the Home Institution	20.20	20.85	22.08	21.60	21.36	21.41	24.00
Experiential Living with a Roommate	2.90	3.85	2.95	2.75	2.63	3.31	5.00
Comparison of Societies Distinct from One's Own	52.10	54.42	49.25	49.60	56.18	49.44	52.00
Observation of Society Distinct from One's Own	15.00	15.28	15.54	15.80	17.36	15.82	14.00
Instructional Program Distinct from that Available at the Home Institution	26.50	25.14	24.87	24.55	26.72	24.58	30.50
Appreciation of a Culture Distinct from One's Own	8.90	9.50	10.08	9.25	11.09	9.62	8.50
Development of the Individual Person	49.00	54.00	49.70	51.30	56.27	51.31	58.00

Form C

Means by Major

- a. humanities (English, philosophy, etc.)
 b. fine arts (music, art, drama, etc.)
 c. natural sciences (chemistry, biology, math, etc.)
 d. social sciences (sociology, anthropology, political science, history, etc.)
 e. language(s)
 f. other: please explain _____
 g. multiple response

	a	b	c	d	e	f	g
Developing Tolerance	17.03	15.65	17.26	16.83	16.11	17.75	17.76
Feelings Directed toward the Home Institution	22.51	22.88	22.90	23.12	21.55	23.27	22.23
Social Interaction with those of a Culture Distinct from One's Own	24.63	23.34	26.42	24.70	25.11	24.06	23.30
Experiential Living with a Roommate	3.48	4.34	5.36	6.24	7.55	8.00	2.76
Comparison of Societies Distinct from One's Own	50.96	52.80	54.00	53.34	51.11	52.79	49.69
Observation of Society Distinct from One's Own	12.40	11.80	13.72	13.07	11.77	13.10	11.53
Instructional Program Distinct from that Available at the Home Institution	20.03	20.88	21.46	20.79	21.55	21.03	19.69
Appreciation of a Culture Distinct from One's Own	11.03	10.65	11.00	10.96	10.88	10.93	10.69
Development of the Individual Person	55.59	52.00	59.46	56.46	52.00	57.65	54.92

Form C

Means by Previous Travel

- a. less than 500 miles
- b. quite extensive, but not outside of the United States or Canada
- c. to one or more foreign countries

	a	b	c
Developing Tolerance	17.00	16.76	17.10
Feelings Directed toward the Home Institution	24.08	22.57	22.76
Social Interaction with those of a Culture Distinct from One's Own	24.08	24.76	25.02
Experiential Living with a Roommate	4.82	5.48	5.94
Comparison of Societies Distinct from One's Own	52.88	53.02	52.58
Observation of Society Distinct from One's Own	13.20	13.08	12.57
Instructional Program Distinct from that Available at the Home Institution	22.20	20.84	20.43
Appreciation of a Culture Distinct from One's Own	11.05	10.73	11.03
Development of the Individual Person	59.94	54.83	56.55

Form C

Means by Other Off-Campus Program

o. omitted			
a. no			
b. yes, please give date(s) and location(s)			
	a	b	c
Developing Tolerance	16.33	17.16	16.56
Feelings Directed toward the Home Institution	22.33	23.43	21.73
Social Interaction with those of a Culture Distinct from One's Own	25.33	24.89	24.55
Experiencial Living with a Roommate	4.33	5.75	5.35
Comparison of Societies Distinct from One's Own	50.33	53.42	51.60
Observation of Society Distinct from One's Own	10.66	13.28	12.09
Instructional Program Distinct from that Available at the Home Institution	15.66	21.43	19.86
Appreciation of a Culture Distinct from One's Own	10.66	10.90	10.97
Development of the Individual Person	52.00	57.63	54.03

Form C

Means by Previous Residence

- a. I have lived in a small town or rural area
 b. I have lived in a suburban area
 c. I have lived in a large city
 d. multiple response

	a	b	c	d
Developing Tolerance	16.56	16.89	18.42	17.09
Feelings Directed toward the Home Institution	22.51	23.45	23.14	21.69
Social Interaction with those of a Culture Distinct from One's Own	24.83	25.22	24.19	23.63
Experiential Living with a Roommate	5.65	5.65	5.47	5.42
Comparison of Societies Distinct from One's Own	53.83	52.49	51.81	52.15
Observation of Society Distinct from One's Own	12.80	13.07	12.19	12.72
Instructional Program Distinct from that Available at the Home Institution	19.86	21.97	22.09	18.54
Appreciation of a Culture Distinct from One's Own	10.94	11.00	no entry	no entry
Development of the Individual Person	56.25	56.70	57.52	55.00

Form C

Means by Present Reading Level

- a. very strong
b. strong
c. mild
d. very mild
e. none

	a	b	c	d	e
Developing Tolerance	14.66	16.40	17.00	16.62	19.31
Feelings Directed toward the Home Institution	23.33	21.96	22.37	23.40	23.95
Social Interaction with those of a Culture Distinct from One's Own	27.00	22.96	23.92	25.25	28.45
Experiential Living with a Roommate	6.66	5.71	5.61	5.45	5.90
Comparison of Societies Distinct from One's Own	51.00	52.59	52.57	52.35	56.04
Observation of Society Distinct from One's Own	9.66	11.03	12.36	13.60	14.77
Instructional Program Distinct from that Available at the Home Institution	20.66	19.43	20.58	21.41	21.59
Appreciation of a Culture Distinct from One's Own	10.66	10.65	11.02	10.75	11.68
Development of the Individual Person	52.66	53.65	55.56	56.52	63.59